DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 312 SO 014 160

AUTHOR Garvey, Helen; Pickus, Robert
TITLE Citizen Responsibility, Conscience, War and the Draft, A Kit for Counselors and Teachers.
INSTITUTION World Education Center, Berkeley, Calif.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 94p.; Small print may not reproduce clearly.
AVAILABLE FROM World Education Center, c/o World Without War Council, 1730 Grove St., Berkeley, CA 94709 ($4.00).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizenship Education; *Citizenship Responsibility; Decision Making Skills; Glossaries; Peace; Religious Factors; Resource Materials; Secondary Education; *War
IDENTIFIERS Conscientious Objectors; *Draft; *Draft Counseling

ABSTRACT

This publication for secondary students, with additional materials for counselors and teachers, deals with the topics of citizen responsibility, conscience, war, and the draft. There are five major sections. Section I, containing three questionnaires, includes questions for students to consider if they are confronting problems of conscience, war, and the draft and a survey to help students think through questions they will face as they consider their response to a compulsory military service law. Section II, "Putting the Questions in Context," contains brief reading selections about war and peace followed by questions to facilitate dialogue and to stimulate thoughtful consideration. Section III contains four readings entitled "What is Conscience?", "The Individual and Society," "Religious and Philosophical Approaches to War," and "Exploring Your Own Religious Tradition." Section IV will be of interest to students who are thinking about registration and the draft. This section includes a Selective Service System leaflet describing the registration process; some questions and answers about the draft; a brief history of conscription in the United States; examples of competing points of view on conscription and national and world security; a brief description of six different responses to military conscription; a memo for those considering a conscientious objector position; and suggestions to help students work their way through a major decision in their life. Appendix materials in the concluding section contain a glossary and a bibliography on conscience and war and a description of the World Without War Council's approach to draft counseling. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED219312

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Helen Garvey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Citizen Responsibility, Conscience, War and the Draft, A Kit for Counselors and Teachers

by

Helen Garvey and Robert Pickus

1980

World Education Center,
c/o World Without War Council
1730 Grove St.
Berkeley, CA 94709
$4.00

SP 014 160

KIT CONTENTS PAGE

WORLD WITHOUT WAR COUNCIL OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

CITIZEN RESPONSIBILITY, CONSCIENCE, WAR AND THE DRAFT

A kit for young people with additional materials for counselors and teachers (* indicates items for counselors, which may also be of interest to young people facing registration)

I. BEFORE YOU BEGIN: Three questionnaires

A. IF ...

B. MILITARY SERVICE AND THE DRAFT: WHAT DO YOU THINK?

* C. WHERE DO I STAND?

II. PUTTING THE QUESTIONS IN CONTEXT

A. THINKING ABOUT WAR AND PEACE
Competing points of view on nine key questions.

* B. UNDERSTANDING CURRENT WAR/PEACE CONTEXTS
What is a "context"? How contexts shape responses to war and peace issues.

* C. CLARIFICATIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS
Ten concepts which are central to the discussion.

D. THREE DEFINITIONS OF PEACE
Distinguishing "peace" as an antonym of war from other uses of the word.

III. THE MORAL DILEMMA

A. WHAT IS CONSCIENCE?

B. THE INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIETY

C. RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHICAL APPROACHES TO WAR

* D. EXPLORING YOUR OWN RELIGIOUS TRADITION
Materials to be inserted as appropriate.

IV. THINKING ABOUT REGISTRATION AND THE DRAFT

A. SELECTIVE SERVICE AND YOU
A Selective Service System leaflet describing the registration process.

B. SOME QUESTIONS AND SOME ANSWERS
About registration and the draft.

- over please -

C. CONSCRIPTION IN THE U.S.: A BRIEF HISTORY

* D. ANALYZING POINTS OF VIEW ON THE DRAFT
Examples of competing points of view on conscription and national and world security.

E. ALTERNATIVE RESPONSES TO MILITARY CONSCRIPTION
A brief description of six different responses.

F. MEMO FOR THOSE CONSIDERING A CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR POSITION
Building a C.O. file.

G. DECISIONS, DECISIONS, DECISIONS
Some suggestions on how to work your way through a major decision in your life.

V. APPENDIX MATERIALS

A. Conscience and War: A Glossary

B. Conscience and War: A Bibliography

C. The World Without War Council's approach to draft counseling

1. A Last Word and An Invitation

* 2. The WWWC's Approach to Draft Counseling
A model of how one organization defines its purposes in draft counseling and the standards it uses to train draft counselors

3. Seven Roads to a World Without War

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Other Materials Available from WWWC

		Price
1.	War and Peace: What Do You Think? A questionnaire designed to help ministers assess their own knowledge and positions on these issues.	$ .15
2.	Church Teaching on War and Peace Notes on current Roman Catholic positions as stated in "The Church in the Modern World" (Second Vatican Council)	.25
3.	Peace, War and the Christian Conscience, by Joseph Fahey A precis of mileposts in Christian attitudes toward war and peace written from a point of view sympathetic to Christian pacifism.	.35
4.	Judaism and War A 30-page 1969 set of questions and reading excerpts prepared for the California Federation of Temple Youth.	1.50
5.	International Human Rights Kit	3.00
6.	World Disarmament Kit	2.50
7.	Neither Victims Nor Executioners, by Albert Camus, with a thoughtful preface by Robert Pickus on the anti-Vietnam war movement, its achievements and its failures.	2.95

WORLD WITHOUT WAR COUNCIL, 1730 GROVE STREET, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94709

IF YOU ARE CONFRONTING PROBLEMS OF CONSCIENCE, WAR AND THE DRAFT

HERE ARE SOME QUESTIONS YOU MIGHT WANT TO CONSIDER

1. If drafted tomorrow, what would your response be?

   a) Resist the draft?
   b) Claim conscientious objector status?
   c) Enlist or prepare to be drafted?

2. Why?

3. If everyone in this country followed your example, how would that affect

   a) the security of our country?
   b) the chances for world peace?

4. Which of the following would figure in your decision? Which heads the list?

   -- personal well-being
   -- respect for life
   -- respect for law
   -- the obligations of citizenship
   -- opposition to war
   -- defense of a free society
   --
   --

5. Do you know what various religious traditions teach about peace? about conscience and war? What other currents of thought and belief influence your answers?

6. If your beliefs conflict with public law, how do you resolve the conflict?

   -- The way Thoreau did.
   -- The way Al Capone did.
   -- The way Lenin did.
   -- The way James Madison did.

   --- Who <u>believes</u> these days?

7. Is war inevitable?

Additional materials and assistance for teachers/counselors/parents and draft-age individuals available from:

World Without War Council
1730 Grove Street
Berkeley CA 94709 415/845-1992

MILITARY SERVICE AND THE DRAFT

WHAT DO YOU THINK?

+ Problems of individual responsibility for national defense are complex in a world where an enemy attack may come from thousands of miles away.

+ They can be even more complex when you are a citizen of a nation that other countries look to for protection and support. Threats to peace are real.

+ Because war destroys human life, war poses problems of conscience for every thoughtful person.

+ Some see modern war as the gravest threat to life on this planet. They cannot in conscience participate.

How will you balance your responsibility to yourself, to your country, and to the idea of respect for life?

This questionnaire was designed to start you thinking about conscience, war, and the draft .....

Prepared by the World Education Center, c/o the World Without War Council, 1730 Grove St. Berkeley, California 94709.

6.80

WHAT DO YOU THINK?

This survey was written to help you think through questions you will face as you consider your response to a compulsory military service law. The questions below deal with problems of war and peace and of citizenship and conscience. We hope you will use them in initiating discussions with parents, teachers and friends.

I. WAR

1. We know that war causes countless deaths and great destruction. But still nations have engaged in war. Why do you think this is so?

2. If, in some way, you were able to change the world to assure that war would no longer be an accepted means of settling international conflict, what changes would you make?

3. Which comes closest to your beliefs?

___ There are some wars that are just and others that are not.

___ War is an evil that can no longer be justified.

___ It's not for the individual to make this decision. You have to support your own country.

Comments:

4a. The use of nuclear weapons cannot be justified.

Agree Tend to Agree Uncertain Tend to Disagree Disagree

4b. Preparation for nuclear war can be justified.

Agree Tend to Agree Uncertain Tend to Disagree Disagree

5. Defending oneself from a mugger by using violence is a different thing from defending one's country in time of war.

Agreee Tend to Agree Uncertain Tend to Disagree Disagree

Comments:

6. Attacking military installations and bombing cities and villages may both be a necessary part of fighting a war.

Agree Tend to Agree Uncertain Tend to Disagree Disagree

Comments:

7. Have members of your family or close friends fought in a war?

Yes No

If your answer is yes, do you think they would say

__ the war they fought in was necessary and justified.
__ the war they fought in could have been prevented.
__ they should not have personally participated in the military in that war.
__ other:

8. Have members of your family or close friends refused induction into the military or actively opposed war and the draft?

Yes No

If your answer is yes, do they now

__ oppose all war and compulsory military service.
__ support the use of military power and the draft when they believe a war is just or as a way of preventing war.
__ other:

II. CHOICES

9. In the past, Americans who received a military draft call responded in a number of ways. Here is a list. Faced with the draft, which of the following choices would be yours? (Circle any words whose meaning, in this situation, is not clear to you.)

A. Enlist in the military before being drafted.

B. When the induction notice comes, report for duty.

C. Refuse to register for the draft and submit to the penalty of the law.

D. Register as a conscientious objector (CO) and serve as a non-combatant in the armed forces. Be willing to go to prison if that classification is denied.

E. Register as a CO and do alternative service in civilian organizations or projects. Be willing to go to prison if that CO classification is denied.

more ...

F. Seek to evade the draft by using legal means (medical deferments, student deferments, etc., if these are allowed).

G. Evade the draft by using illegal means (falsifying records, lying, going underground, etc.).

H. Leave the country.

I. I don't know.

10. Which choices in question 9 do you look upon with approval?

Of which choices do you disapprove?

Comments:

III. LAW

11. In a country, such as the United States, where the government is based upon law and where people elect their lawmakers, do you believe that the laws of the land should apply to everyone? that everyone has an obligation to obey them?

Yes No

Comments:

12. If a person believes a law of his country requires him to do something that is morally wrong, that person should

__ obey the law anyway, while working for changes in the law.

__ disobey the law and accept the penalty of the law.

__ disobey the law and evade the penalty of the law.

Comments:

13. Our country's selective service laws respect the conscience of those who oppose all war. These individuals are classified as conscientious objectors and are not required to serve as combatants. Should our country also exempt from combatant service those who believe a particular war is unjust or unwise?

Yes No

Comments:

IV. RESOURCES

14. Do you know what your religious tradition teaches about conscience and war?

    Do you know how to find out?

15. Have you done any reading on these problems?

    Would you be interested in a list of books expressing different points of view?

16. Is there anyone you know that you'd like to talk with about the choices you face?

    Who?

17. Would you be interested in joining a discussion in your school or church on problems of war/peace and conscience?

V. In the space below, please list further questions you want to explore, information you want to find, as well as some of your personal reflections on the survey.

WHERE DO I STAND?

Citizen Responsibility, Conscience and War

As used in this survey "conscience and war" refers to those moral and political judgments occasioned by the conflict between conscience and the obligations of citizenship and by the problematic relationship of preparations for defense to the advent of war. These are difficult questions on which equally thoughtful and religiously motivated people have disagreed.

WHERE DO YOU STAND? If a printed answer does not speak your mind, check more than one response if that seems right or write in your own response. This self-survey is intended to help stimulate your thinking, not bind you to pre-determined answers.

I. Awareness

A. Problems of conscience and war have entered into my teaching/counseling in the past six months

_____often and persistently
_____occasionally
_____rarely
_____not at all

B. Problems of conscience and war have touched my mind and spirit in the past six months

_____profoundly
_____as a steady concern
_____hardly at all

C. I tend to approach these questions in a context which emphasises:

_____the personal well-being of the young people with whom I talk.
_____the obligations of citizenship and respect for law.
_____opposition to war and respect for life
_____the defense of a free society
_____political understanding of what makes for and what prevents war (e.g. the balance of power; growth toward world law)
_____religious obligation
_____other:

II. You and the Draft

A. Have you personally faced the draft? _____yes _____no

If your answer is yes, what did you do?

B. For the moment assume that you are 18 years old. You have no family or vocational responsibilities. The world situation is as it is today. If you personally faced a military draft next month, would you

_____go into the military?
_____refuse to register and accept the penalty of the law?
_____seek a deferment?
_____leave the country?
_____file for conscientious objector status (I-O, i.e., no military service) and fulfill civilian alternative requirements?
_____file for conscientious objector classification (I-A-O, i.e., not required to carry a gun) and serve as a medic or in some other non-combatant capacity in the military?
_____go to jail if CO classification is denied?
_____find some way to evade military service, legally or otherwise?
_____join an underground resistance group that challenges, not just the Selective Service Law, but the validity of the American legal system?

C. Which of the following values, when they come in conflict, have greater weight in your thinking about problems of conscience and war? (Circle your choice).

1. legitimate authority/personal values
2. personal well-being/ responsible citizenship
3. responsiblity to humankind/responsibility to the political community that nutured you
4. religious teachings of the Church/personal values
5. religious teachings of the Church/responsibility to the nation
6. pursuit of justice and defense of freedom (war being judged a necessary means) / pursuit of justice and defense of freedom (non-violent means judged as the only legitimate defense)
7. law/conscience
8. survival of others/personal survival

D. Which of the positions below comes closest to a summary description of your basic beliefs?

_____patriotic obligation to perform military service
_____some form of just war theory
_____pacifist refusal to support organized mass violence
_____personal focus on the immediate situation of the individual
_____work for a world that resolves international conflict without mass violence
_____other:

III. Attitudes

What would be your initial reaction to each of the following?

A. Conscientious objectors to war

_____accept and support
_____regard them skeptically
_____consider them bad citizens
_____ would need to know more
_____other:

B. Those who refuse to comply with the Selective Service Law, i.e., who refuse to register or refuse induction

_____accept and support
_____accept and support only if they openly accept the penalty of the law and are clearly conscientiously opposed to war
_____oppose because they reject the obligations of citizenship
_____oppose because they undermine the defense of our society
_____would need to know more
_____other:

C. Military personel

_____accept and support
_____accept and support only if the choice is made conscientiously
_____oppose because they make war more likely
_____would need to know more
_____other:

D. A group which wants a cut in the U.S. military budget, opposes registration for the draft and the development of any new U.S. weapons, e.g. the Trident submarine

_____accept them as moral leaders showing the way to a better world
_____regard them as fools who do not understand the real world and who pose a threat to this country's security and world peace
_____see them as workers for peace
_____consider them communists or communist dupes
_____would need to know more before making a judgment
_____other:

E. A group which wants to increase the U.S. military budget, favors deploying Pershing missiles in Europe and supports the development of the neutron bomb

_____support them as intelligent leaders seeking to prevent war by deterring Soviet military action
_____regard them as fools that are laying the groundwork for World War III
_____consider them dupes of the military/industrial complex
_____look upon them as contributing to U.S. security
_____would need to know more
_____other:

F. A group working to develop alternatives to reliance on violence as the way to resolve conflict and achieve security

_____support them as people who are addressing the primary task
_____regard them as engaged in a naive and futile effort
_____would have to know more
_____other:

IV. Helping Others

A. If a young person, facing a decision with regard to military service and the draft called you tonight, would you

_____meet with him confidently?
_____meet with him with a clear sense of inadequacy?
_____refer him to someone else?

B. What do you consider the proper functions of draft counseling/draft education efforts? (Put "P" for those considered propser, "I" for those considered improper.)

_____provision of accurate information about the options open to people facing the draft
_____stimulating a searching exploration of problems of conscience and war including presentation of critiques of competing perspectives
_____encouraging an open statement of position and honesty in relation to the draft board
_____aiding people in finding ways to avoid or resist the draft
_____supporting people who are conscientiously opposed to war if they are honest, non-violent, and if they accept the penalty of the law
_____encouraging all, whatever their stand on the draft, to act in ways that help strengthen alternatives to war

V. C. How well do you know

1. Selective service law and requirements?

_____I have copies of the legislation and have studied the requirements.
_____I've read summaries of the law.
_____I really do not know the specifics of the law.
_____other:

2. The different organizations in your area that are working on war/peace issues and conscience and war concerns? Are you able to identify their political contexts, i.e.,their assumptions judgments, beliefs and values?

_____I know of a number of organizations and can pretty well describe their contexts.
_____I know of a number of organizations but really do not know their contexts.
_____The field is new to me.

3 . Conscience and war resource agencies and people in your area to whom you can refer young people and/or their parents?

_____I have a good list.
_____I know of some but want to know more.
_____This is one of my real needs.

4. The different perspectives on how should act when their beliefs come in conflict with the law? Do you understand the differences between Henry Thoreau, Al Capone, Vladimer Lenin and James Madison?

Can you explain them to young people?

Prepared by The World Education Center
and The World Without War Council
1730 Grove Street
Berkeley, 94709

7.80

THINKING ABOUT WAR

Acts of sacrifice and heroism, death and destruction are some of the images that come to mind when we think of war. But perhaps the most accurate description of war can be summed up in one word: tragedy. War is a tragedy because of the human lives that are lost or damaged. It is tragic because resources needed to improve human life are used instead to destroy life.

Few today, despite those qualities of courage, loyalty and patriotism that abound in combat, defend the institution of war. But most people still believe that it is necessary. Many believe it is inevitable.

If asked "why do we have war?" people will generally begin their list of the causes of war. But it is probably more important to answer this question in terms of function rather than in terms of causes. "What does war do?" is the functional question that should precede consideration of whether or not it is possible to have a world without war.

What function does war perform? Quite simply, war settles disputes between nations and peoples. Guns, bombs, nuclear weapons are not "insane" instruments. They perform a specific function. When no other way is available, they settle arguments.

Can we find an alternative way of performing this function? Given the human condition, we will always have conflicts and misunderstandings. But mass organized violence -- war -- is not the only way to settle such disputes (e.g., there are negotiations, economic sanctions, third party intervention, legal and political processes for resolving conflict).

Some will say that war has become too much a part of our way of thinking and acting for it ever to be eliminated. In the 1800's, there were many who believed that slavery was wrong but said that it was impossible to do away with that social institution. Today, oppression may remain, but by and large, the world has left slavery behind.

- TO THE READER:

What you have just read is an explanation of my response to the first of the nine questions listed below. These questions are an attempt to go below the surface of each day's headlines and examine what people believe about war and peace and about what the United States can and should do to advance peace. The last statement under each question is the point of view of the World Without War Council (WWWC), the organization that developed the questionnaire. Needless to say, the wording of the statements reflects WWWC's understandings of what can help move us toward peace. In preparing the questions, WWWC did try to summarize competing views fairly and accurately as they have heard them expressed.

The questions and responses are both limited and brief. We have chosen only a few of the many possible answers to each question. The set of answers an individual gives to the questions make up his/her perspective on problems of war and peace. Understanding a person's war/peace perspective is more important than knowing his/her stand on specific issues.

over ...

People do not make decisions about war/peace issues in a vacuum. They make them (wittingly or unwittingly) based on what they assume or judge to be true about this country, about adversary societies, and what they cherish and want to protect and defend. If you identify a person's war/peace perspective, you can make a fairly accurate prediction of where he or she will come out on a particular issue.

As you go through the nine questions below, you may come up against ideas that challenge what you think. You may want to investigate these challenges as well as examine your own ideas. Some may find that this questionnaire is difficult because the ideas summarized are indeed complex or because they may not have thought about these questions before. Do your best to respond to the questions. Do not hesitate to seek help from teachers, parents and friends. We invite you to call the World Education Center (WEC) or the World Without War Council and discuss the questions with someone on our staff.

--- NINE QUESTIONS ---

DIRECTIONS. *After reading each statement carefully, indicate the response that most nearly speaks your mind. You may find that none of the statements offered do. Feel free to write your own. You may think that the questions we've identified are not the ones that most need to be clarified. If so, we invite your help in improving this questionnaire by suggesting other fundamental questions which ought to be included.*

1. Is an end to war possible?

___ A. Ending war will require fundamental changes in human nature; we must work for a world of harmony and justice in which the conflicts and tensions that lead to war have been eliminated.

___ B. Ending war is an impossible goal; it is naive and utopian to expect people responsible for national security to take such a goal seriously.

___ C. Ending war does not require changing human nature or eliminating conflict. It does require that nations and peoples work together to

develop a basic sense of world community -- one that will support minimal kinds of agreements so that disputes between nations and peoples can be settled without the use of the mass violence of war.

___ D. Other (please specify):

2. What gets in the way of peace?

___ A. It is America -- capitalist, imperialist, militarized, opposed to progressive social and political change -- that constitutes the primary obstacle to progress toward a more humane and peaceful global order. The main thrust of work for peace should be to oppose American power as exercised by the military-industrial complex.

___ B. The primary threat to world peace is located in the Communist world and among left wing revolutionary elements in the Third World. Work for peace ought to be focused on the real problem, i.e., changing the policies and behaviors of those nations now committed to aggressive violence.

___ C. This country is an important part of the problem of war, as are Communist and Third World nations. But the problem of war is not rooted in any single nation or ideological/economic/political system, but in the international system as a whole. Nations rely on military power to defend their interests. Sound work for peace cannot ignore the threat and the fact of military aggression used by nations in seeking to promote their "national interests." The alterations needed are systemic and will involve changed policies and behaviors by all nations.

___ D. Other (please specify):

3. Can the U.S. help?

___ A. This country is not now capable of a constructive role in world affairs. The U.S. must transform its own social, political and economic structures before it can make a positive contribution to world peace.

___ B. The U.S. is doing what it can to help ensure progress toward a more humane and peaceful world. It is essential that other nations recognize this and join in the effort.

___ C. The U.S., by virtue of its political and religious traditions, and its wealth and power, is especially qualified to assume a leadership role in progress toward an end to war. Turning that potential for leadership into an actuality will require changes of attitude, commitment and purpose by the American people and their government. These changes can be brought about within the present structure of American society.

___ D. Other (please specify):

over ...

4. What role should the U.S. play in world affairs?

___ A. American foreign policy can best aid in progress toward global justice and peace by reducing its military, political and economic control over other nations, particularly those in the Third World. The U.S. should support liberation movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America and it should withdraw support from repressive regimes.

___ B. The U.S. has, to a large extent, given up leadership in world affairs. This country should reassert its power and let both our allies and our adversaries know that they will be dealing with a strong America.

___ C. This country could play a crucial role in progress toward an end to war (1) if its foreign policy accurately perceived the obstacles to achieving disarmament, world law and political order, and social and economic development; and (2) if its guiding purpose were progress toward the non-violent resolution of international conflict and constructive global systems change.

___ D. Other (please specify):

5. How should the U.S. approach problems of disarmament?

___ A. The United States should immediately and unilaterally take steps toward a drastic reduction in its military establishment. The arms race is fueled by advances in American technology. If the U.S. disarms, others will follow.

___ B. We should continue to pursue efforts to achieve arms reductions through negotiations while maintaining the stable balance of power on which the world depends.

___ C. Reductions in our relative military capability have already led to a dangerous situation in which we can no longer be sure of the adequacy of our defense. We should strengthen, not reduce, our defense capabilities. We should do that now, before it's too late.

___ D. The present situation <u>is</u> dangerous. Negotiations alone will not lead us out of it. The U.S. should make general, complete and enforceable disarmament its goal. It should then devise a strategy of unilateral initiatives that will create pressures on the Soviet Union and other nations for agreement on those specific arms control and disarmament measures that will best lead toward that goal.

___ E. Other (please specify):

6. What should be the U.S. attitude toward international institutions?

___ A. The world now has a network of international institutions adequate to the task of developing world law and maintaining political order. What is needed is a stronger American commitment to these institutions (e.g., the United Nations) so that they can function more effectively.

___ B. The recent history of the U.N. and other international institutions demonstrates that they can do more harm than good. Political rhetoric and irresponsible actions on the part of Third World nations makes work for peace through the U.N. impossible. The U.S. ought to drastically re-evaluate its support of such organizations (and perhaps even withdraw from them).

___ C. This country ought to give high priority to improving existing international institutions so they can provide the structures needed by the nascent world community. Developing these structures will involve changes in present international institutions and in the policies of all nations.

___ D. Other (please specify):

7. What should be the approach to improving world economic relations?

___ A. An equitable world order will respond first to the needs and demands of the developing nations. The goal should be the elimination of economic exploitation and inequalities between rich and poor nations.

___ B. The effective functioning of the world economic system depends primarily on the continued productive capacity of the industrialized nations. Nothing will be gained by policies which undercut the economies of the developed nations. If the industrialized countries experience recession, repercussions of this will be suffered -- even more dramatically -- in the poor countries.

___ C. What is needed is international agreement on a world economic system capable of dealing with the real problems all nations face in a world of increasing interdependence and resource scarcity. These agreements will require changes in the policies and behaviors of both developed and developing nations.

___ D. Other (please specify):

8. How should the U.S. deal with an increasingly interdependent world?

___ A. The world has truly become a global village. An outmoded concept, national sovereignty, is the primary obstacle to progress toward a sense of world community. The facts of interdependence require more humane and peaceful U.S. policies.

over ...

___ B. The world is, as always, a dangerous place, and talk about world community is premature at best. Interdependence is nothing new. The nation-state remains the only viable basis of political organization in our world. Let us make haste slowly in welcoming an illusory new era of universal brotherhood and cooperation.

___ C. The reality of an interdependent world becomes more apparent every day. Interdependence can produce war and world chaos. It can also be the occasion for a heightened sense of world community which fosters cooperation in addressing global problems. The U.S. should take as one of its foreign policy goals the development of regional and international institutions designed to settle disputes between nations non-violently. The U.S. should continue to support both governmental and non-governmental efforts which help Americans understand other countries and vice versa.

___ D. Other (please specify):

9. What can the average person do?

___ A. There is little we can do to shape the goals and purposes of American foreign policy. It is now controlled by the interests and influence of powerful corporations and the American military establishment. Little attention is given to the wishes of the American people.

___ B. Most foreign policy decisions involve knowledge and information not available to ordinary citizens. We ought to leave such complex choices to political leaders. Efforts to extend public participation to foreign policy will merely weaken our government's capacity to act.

___ C. American foreign policy by and large reflects the wishes of the American people. Our political system is sufficiently open and responsive to make it worthwhile for citizens to attempt to help shape the values and purposes which guide U.S. foreign policy.

___ D. Other (please specify):

prepared by the World Education Center
c/o World Without War Council
1730 Grove Street
Berkeley CA 94709

8.1.80

DRAFT

UNDERSTANDING CURRENT WAR/PEACE CONTEXTS

The foreign policy discussion and most peace activity in this country tend to focus on specific current issues or policy choices. The question usually asked is "Where do you stand on ... ?" and the answer is usually a simple pro or con. But a simple statement pro or con on a single issue, or even on a series of issues, does not tell much about a person's fundamental orientation. It often happens that two people may agree in opposition to a proposed policy -- for instance, building a new weapons system -- but for very different reasons: a pacifist because he's opposed to all weapons and a military strategist because he views this particular weapon as unnecessary or ineffective.

A person's position on a given issue is not simply a response to the choices posed; it is an expression of the basic assumptions, values and purposes which guide his thinking about problems of war and peace in general. That set of fundamental values, goals and political beliefs is what we call a "context." If you understand a person's context for thinking about war/peace problems, it is fairly easy to predict where he will stand on any number of specific issues.

Below is a series of questions which focus on key elements in any war/peace context. Following each question are a number of possible answers which reflect the range of attitudes and beliefs current in the war/peace discussion in this country. These questions are designed to aid you both in thinking through your own attitudes on these fundamental choices and in understanding other currents of thought which are moving in the country.

* * * * * * *

1. How do you view the <u>problem of war</u> and <u>the goal</u> of world peace?

   a. War is in the nature of things, and you can't fundamentally change the way things are: i.e., there will always be wars and rumors of wars.

   b. War is a product of unjust patterns of human social, political and economic organization, but those patterns can be changed: i.e., through a fundamental reorganization of human societies, the causes of war can be eliminated and a world free of war and injustice can be achieved.

   c. War is rooted in human nature, but human nature can be changed: i.e., through a fundamental spiritual transformation of the human psyche, the real causes of war can be eliminated and a world of harmony and love can be achieved.

   d. War is a fact of life -- an integral part of the present international system. Nobody knows how to change that system in a fundamental way, so the best we can hope for is a kind of armed truce sustained by a balance of power.

   e. War is an instrument of power used by certain nations and ideological systems to impose their will on others. Ending war would mean changing or destroying those who initiate wars so the rest of us can live in peace.

over ...

f. War is a symptom of disorder -- of anarchy. Only through the global hegemony of a single power or system would it be possible to eliminate war -- and the cure may be worse than the disease.

g. The causes of war are many and complex, but one thing is clear: war is a human institution -- a way of resolving conflict through organized mass violence -- which exists because it is accepted as legitimate. Ending war will mean developing viable alternative means of resolving conflicts which are inevitable. The goal: a disarmed world under law with a sense of community sufficient to sustain the instruments of governance needed for the nonviolent resolution of international conflict and constructive global systems change.

h. Other:

2. What are the core moral and political values on which your vision of the goal of world peace is based?

a. "Freedom":

i. For whom? (the individual, the group/nation)
ii. Of what? (political, religious, economic activity)
iii. From what? (fear, want, war, oppression)

b. "Equality":

i. Of what? (wealth, opportunity, social standing)
ii. With respect to whom?
iii. How achieved/enforced?

c. "Justice":

i. How defined?
ii. How achieved?
iii. How related to competing conceptions of justice?

d. "Ecological Balance":

i. How defined?
ii. At what costs?

e. "Sanctity of the Human Being":

i. How understood?
ii. What implications?

f. "Survival":

i. Of whom or what?
ii. Under what conditions?

g. "Progress":

i. How defined? (material, spiritual, social, political)
ii. At what costs?

h. "Human Well Being":

i. How defined?

i. "Peace":

i. How defined?

3. What do you see as the primary obstacles to progress toward world peace?

   a. American foreign policy which is dominated by the military-industrial complex (the Pentagon) and the multinational corporations (capitalist imperialism).

   b. Communist nations' foreign policies which are shaped by an ideological commitment to world domination.

   c. Various left-wing, totalitarian-oriented revolutionary regimes and movements in the third world.

   d. Various right-wing dictatorships in the third world.

   e. The lack of commitment to and agreement on steps toward world peace among all nations.

   f. The gap between rich and poor nations.

   g. The lack of effective institutions of world law and political order.

   h. The existence of the nuclear arsenals of the superpowers and the resulting arms race.

   i. The lack of a developed sense of world community.

   j. The inability of the nascent world community to find effective cooperative approaches to common global problems.

   k. The lack of credible models and techniques for the nonviolent prosecution of conflict.

   l. Other:

4. To what extent should the U.S. seek active engagement in world affairs?

   a. To a considerable degree -- our interests and the world's demand it.

   b. To a limited degree -- based on intelligent calculations of our national interests.

   c. To a very limited degree -- overextension of foreing commitments has done great damage to domestic conditions.

   d. Little or none -- we are more likely to do harm than good in the world.

   e. Not at all -- the U.S. is the primary cause of the world's problems and its withdrawal from world affairs would be a blessing.

   f. Other:

5. What foreign policy strategy do you believe offers the best hope for overcoming the obstacles to progress toward world peace?

   a. Seek military superiority in order to force changes in the policies and behavior of adversary nations.

   b. Primary reliance on national military power to prevent war through deterrence and to defend vital interests and core values.

over ...

c. Primary reliance on national military power, combined with a willingness to negotiate agreements in areas of common interest.

d. Unilateral disarmament to end the arms race and a commitment to pursue other needed goals regardless of the policies and behavior of adversary nations.

e. Withdrawal of American military power to a level adequate only for strict self-defense, and a withdrawal of political influence from all areas of the world except our closest allies.

f. A reversal of traditional patterns of support -- away from repressive right-wing regimes and toward progressive revolutionary forces.

g. A commitment to undertake unilateral non-military initiatives designed to move other nations toward agreement on common steps toward peace.

h. Other:

6. What is your view of American society and its potential for leadership in progress toward world peace?

a. We are a good society and our present foreign policy is the most important force for peace in the world.

b. Despite its problems and shortcomings, American society is potentially an enormous resource for leadership toward world peace; we are now part of the problem of war, but our traditions, power and wealth qualify us, perhaps uniquely, for a creative and constructive role in world affairs.

c. We have a lot of problems here at home which we have to solve before we can even begin to think about leading the world to peace.

d. American society is racist, corrupt, and imperialist; only after a fundamental transformation of our political, economic and social institutions could we play a positive role in the world.

e. Other:

7. What strategy for bringing about needed changes in this country makes most sense to you?

a. Focus on political leaders and decision-makers -- run for office or organize lobbying efforts.

b. Organize a broad peace constituency around a series of specific war/peace issues.

c. Build a core movement of committed peace activists.

d. Engage a broad mainstream peace constituency through "context" education.

e. Organize for revolution.

f. Concentrate on research and idea development.

CLARIFICATIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

Some Notes for Teachers and Counselors

Assisting young people in dealing with problems related to war and the draft will not be easy. These present difficult and complex questions. One way that adults can assist young people make thoughtful decisions is to help them explore some fundamental ideas about themselves, their obligation to the county, their religious and moral beliefs, and their responsiblity to contribute to the welfare of the human family.

Each of the ten concepts listed below is briefly described and then followed by questions which we hope will facilitate dialogue and stimulate thoughtful consideration.

Identity An individual finds her/his identity in many ways. Some define themselves by their vocation (architect), skill (pianist), political belief (democrat), responsibility (mother). All of us find identity in our family names as well as in our homelands and cultural and religious beliefs. Each of us has many loyalities which most often complement each other but there may be times when these loyalities conflict. Here we are talking about identity in the communities which nutured us.

-- Who are you? (family, country, ethnic origin, religion, etc.)
-- List the benefits that are yours because of the various communities of which you are a part.
-- What responsibilities do you have to each of these communities?

Political Community Americans experience political community on many levels (city, county, state and nation). Our government, though imperfect, is based on concepts of rights and duties (the duties to participate in seeking and defending the common good; the rights of individuals and minorities in relation to government). On each level of political community, government is required to protect citizens from dangers within (criminal acts, disorder, etc.) and dangers from without (disadvantage in trade agreements, attack, etc.).

The world is made up of over 150 nations, each with a particular form of government. Governments of all nations regard the maintenance of their national security as a primary responsibility.

-- List some of the conflicts between various political communities within our national boundaries. How are these settled?
-- List some of the disagreements between nations. How are these settled?
-- What are some of your responsibilities as a U.S. citizen? Do you believe that military service is one of them? If so, are there any conditions under which you would not serve?

Political Authority Most people recognize that it is necessary for good order within the nation that governments have the right to make and enforce laws and that citizens have an obligation to obey the law.

-- Are people required to obey all laws? Are there some exceptions? If your answer is yes, what laws and what is the justification?
-- When one, in conscience, cannot obey the law, is there an obligation to accept the penalty for disobeying it?
-- What is the obligation, if any, to obey the laws of a government which is not formed by and responsible to its citizens?
-- Is there a special case for the exercise of authority in the military? Must a soldier obey every command?

Conflict Conflict is an integral part of human experience. It can be functional or dysfunctional. Conflict exists on many levels (intra- and inter-personal, intra- and inter-group, and intra- and international). Different levels of conflict require different methods and strategies for resolution. Conflict can be resolved violently or non-violently.

-- Would the world be a better place if there were no conflicts? Is a harmonious world possible?
-- Divorce, arbitration and diplomacy are examples of conflict resolution on the personal, group and national levels. Think of other examples. In what ways are they similar? How are they different?
-- Are there non-violent ways of prosecuting conflict? of defending values? Do you understand why law is sometimes described as "a process of non-violent conflict resolution"? What other government processes fit that definition? Which are operative internationally?

Force/Power/Violence These three concepts are listed together because they are often confused. This is one way to distinguish them. "Force" and "power" have their origins in the physical sciences. Force is the more general term. It simply is that which causes change. Power connotes control and effectiveness and, used in the political sense, refers to the ability to achieve desired goals. It describes influence over others' actions. Violence seeks to bring about change or influence and control others by the threat or the fact of injury. In themselves, force and power are neutral terms. Depending on their use they may or may not require justification. Violence, on the other hand, must always be justified because, of its very nature, it is destructive.

-- Think of times when you have been forced to do something or when you have forced others to do something. Were there times when the use of force was wrong? was right?
-- In our country, political power is used by many different groups and individuals, including the government. Identify some of these and describe their power.
-- In what ways are street violence, police violence and the violence of war alike? In what ways are they different?

Peace There are many definitions of peace but if we look carefully at them we will find that most will fall into one of three categories; inner peace, sometimes referred to as peace with God; harmony in the community or lack of conflict; and peace in society, sometimes described as the absence of war but more correctly defined as nonviolent conflict resolution through agreed-upon processes.

-- How do inner peace and social harmony differ from peace as the absence of war?
-- Is one kind of peace a prerequisite for another kind?
-- What kinds of systems are needed so that nations and peoples can resolve their conflicts without resort to war?

War Here we refer to one particular form of conflict resolution--the mass organized violence of war. War is a planned and deliberate undertaking of a government and justified as the only effective way to deal with a threat to the nation. War requires that the resources of the community be organized to overcome the enemy. Today's wars are characterized by the use of sophisticated weapons that make little distinction betwen a military target and the population that surrounds it, between the soldier and the civilian, between the old and the young. Since the end of World War II, there have been more than 300 conventional wars (wars fought with non-nuclear weapons). Since that time, we have lived under the threat of a nuclear war.

-- Some people have seen little difference between acts of terrorism and war itself. Are there significant differences?
-- Are there some things worse than war? What about nuclear war?
-- Can preparation for war prevent war? Is a world without war possible?

Conscience and Moral Authority Most people recognize what we refer to in the individual as a conscience, i.e. the ability to make judgments about the goodness or badness of a particular act. Acting according to conscience may, at times, take courage. We respect those who sincerely follow their consciences. However, it may be that an individual, who acts according to her/his conscience, is sometimes looked upon with suspicion--others believing that this person's conscience is ill-formed, confused, unintelligent, or overly influenced by self-interest, etc. The action that the conscientious individual takes may be perceived to be a threat to the welfare of the community or of others in the society.

To guard against an action that may endanger the community and to protect the right of the individual conscience, we look beyond the individual's judgment to an authority vested with the right and power to justify and legitimize action. This we call moral authority. It is the external standard that both guides the individual in making decisions about right and wrong and serves as a measure for the acceptance or rejection of that judgment on the part of others in a community. In some instances, it is the Church or sacred scriptures or the religious body that provides the moral authority. At other times, it is the customs of the community or the laws of the nation. In still others, moral authority is vested in an individual leader who is wise or knowledgeable or holy. It may be because s/he holds an official position of authority in the community.

-- How do you know when something is right or wrong? Who else says so?
-- According to what criteria do you accept or reject the action of others who claim moral justification?

-- What does the Church say regarding participation in war? What about scriptures and tradition?
-- What is the basis of the moral authority of the state? Why should we respect the law?

Civil Disobedience "To break a law of the land is always serious, but it is not always wrong." This quote from Robert Bolt gives a very general definition of civil disobedience. There are a variety of more specific definitions that differ considerably. Acceptance of the concept of civil disobedience depends on (a) whether an individual believes that there is an authority superior to the state (God, conscience, philosophy, etc.) and (b) whether s/he believes that a person is ever justified in breaking a law in a democratic society where the will of the majority and the Constitution guide and limit legislators.

-- Do you believe that there is an authority superior to the state? If so, what is that authority and what does it mean in your life?
-- If attempts to change a law that you believe to be immoral have failed, should you then comply with the law?
-- Should individuals be punished for refusing to obey a law that they consider immoral?
-- What is the difference between civil disobedience and the way Al Capone or Vladimer Lenin treated the law, the former in Chicago in the 1920s and the latter in Russia in 1916/1917?
-- Have you studied the lives of those who believed civil disobedience was justified, e.g. Thoreau, Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr? Have you considered the person who won't pay her/his taxes because s/he objects to welfare legislation or the individual who refuses to comply with the law requiring preferential hiring of minorities?
-- How well do you know Church teaching about individual conscience and governmental authority?

Morality and Government Should governments, like individuals, be guided by moral standards that give direction to and justify actions? For those who respond yes, there is further discussion needed regarding the question of whether criteria for what is moral in the individual is different from that required to judge morality in the actions of governments.

-- What might be the criteria for judging the morality of an individual's participation in war or her/his refusal to do so?
-- Assume that you agree that governments should be guided by moral standards. What might be some of the criteria for judging the morality of a government's defense preparations and/or its waging of war?

Prepared by the World Education Center
c/o The World Without War Council
1730 Grove Street
Berkeley, CA 94709
415/845-1992

6.80

APPENDIX: A Comment on Civil Disobedience

Because many young people are encouraged to refuse to register by various political and religious groups (much like the resistance movement during Vietnam) who call for "civil disobedience", a brief essay is included here. The essay, written by Helen Garvey, SNJM, presents one point of view. It is hoped that it will encourage further discussion and debate of this topic. Other points of view are listed in the bibliography included in the student materials.

Few of us require justification for resistance to totalitarian or dictatorial regimes. If we have questions, they generally center on practical considerations (Will this strategy work?) and/or the morality of the means used (whether the end justifies the use of such means). But when it comes to refusal to comply with a law, or set of laws, in a democratic society, we ask for a justification that is essentially moral. By what right does the individual or the minority take it upon themselves to use illegal means to alter or abolish laws and policies expressly or tacitly supported by the majority? The response, I believe, must be that there is a conflict between conscience and law, not between the political judgments of the majority and those of the individual or of the minority.

I suggest that civil disobedience (refusal to obey the law because of reasons of conscience) may be justified in (1) the traditions (religious or philosophical) that posit an authority superior to the state and that postulates moral criteria by which individuals judge the policies of the government and in (2) democratic political theories that recognize that the will of the majority cannot be equated with truth or justice. In some instances, civil disobedience is not only acceptable, but necessary, in order that the society be challenged to remain true to its fundamental values.

Civil disobedience that protects, rather than threatens or destroys, these values, must be rooted in respect for human dignity and committed to building, rather than weakening, community. More specifically, civil disobedience:

- -- is warrented by only grave concerns and then employed only after institutional channels for change have either been exhausted or have consistently closed their doors to those who sought the change.
- -- endeavors to change or abolish a law or set of laws, not the system of law. (This assumes a democratic form of government.)
- -- acts in public, not in secret, and clearly articulates the reasons for the actions taken.
- -- accepts the penalty for breaking the law, thus demonstrating acceptance of the authority of government while opposing a particular law or set of laws.
- -- attempts to persuade the majority, not impose its will on them.
- -- rejects violence.

THREE DEFINITIONS OF PEACE

By Benjamin Seaver

Anyone who talks to people about peace soon discovers that there is a great deal of confused thinking on the subject. Unfortunately, those of us who consider ourselves workers in this field add our full share to the confusion. I am convinced that at least part of our difficulty arises from the word peace itself. Peace is one of those simple words in common usage that no one ordinarily bothers to define. Yet it has at least three distinct meanings, different enough so that any agreement on a way to peace is impossible unless we first agree on which peace we are talking about.

1. One meaning of peace refers to an inner state, that serenity of soul, that tranquility of mind and conscience, which arises from a proper relationship between the individual and his Creator. Religious organizations ought to encourage their members to seek this inner peace, but in no sense can it be considered a proper object for social action. No one can win inner peace for another. It is purely an individual, a personal matter. It should be noted, also, that inner peace and war are not mutually exclusive terms. It is quite conceivable that a man might have the sense of inner peace in the midst of war.

2. A second meaning of peace equates it with the complete absence of all conflict, a state of being in which all men live in harmony with each other in a world governed by love and understanding. This kind of peace is something men have never known on this earth. It is a concept of peace as an ultimate goal precisely because it can never be fully realized in any finite time and will always be there to give men guidance and direction in his eternal search for perfection.

It is this concept which people have in mind when they say we can never have peace until man has given up his selfishness and greed and all his other thorny egocentricities. This is like saying man will never fly until he grows wings. If this statement refers to the self-propelled flight reputed to angels, its truth is self-evident. But if it is intended to deny that man, by means of an instrument he has created moves through the air from place to place, then it denies a fact of every day experience. Similarly, this statement about the impossibility of peace is correct if it refers merely to a society in which brotherhood and understanding have replaced all conflict. But if it is intended to deny that men can live together, settling their conflicts by means of an instrument they have created, without recourse to war, then it denies another fact of every day experience. Because a peace of love and harmony is impossible to imperfect men, it does not follow that war is inevitable. No one would claim that we enjoy this sort of peace in our local, state, or national communities, yet the conflicts which arise from human failings in these areas do not lead to war. Since the absence of war does not necessarily imply the presence of a peace of love and harmony, these terms are not antonyms.

(over)

3. But the words peace and war are generally used as opposites. There must be a third meaning of peace which is the antonym of war. Peace, according to this definition, is public order and security commanded by the laws of a sovereign government. This definition describes the only sort of social peace man has ever known, the peace of the governed community. In a sense, the entire history of mankind is the story of the growth of these governed communities, these peace units, from the earliest tribes to the present great nation states. There is an obvious trend in this history, a trend toward even larger and more extensive peace units. The logical end of this trend is the largest possible peace unit, a governed world community. Politically, we are at present in the nation state stage, but our science and technology are making our world an ever more interdependent unit. Today, our very survival may depend on our ability to bring our political institutions abreast of our technologically united world.

It is important to note that this peace of law and order does not require man to be any better or different from the way he now is. Nor does it promise us the end of all conflict. Instead, it points to the technique of government as a means of minimizing the chances of conflict and of providing a just, orderly and lawful way of settling those conflicts which do occur. Furthermore, the establishment of a world peace of law and order would in no way obstruct or run counter to a man's efforts toward the ultimate goal, the peace of love and harmony. On the contrary, since war does deny and make a mockery of this ultimate goal, and since the peace of law and order would abolish war, its establishment is one of the necessary steps toward that goal.

... Inner peace, arising as it does from a true relationship between God and man, is certainly a central theme of worship. The peace of love and harmony is the aim of all work for reconciliation of whatever sort. Never has the world needed an active ministry of reconciliation so much as it does today. But however necessary and important this work is, let no one delude himself into thinking that this is the way to prevent war. To attempt to abolish war by eliminating conflicts is like trying to remove the dangers of floods on the Mississippi by drying up the river at its source. Of course the seeds of conflict are in the hearts and minds of men, and it is man's eternal task to eliminate them. But whether or not conflicting interests lead to war depends largely on the political context in which they occur. If the conflicts take place between men living under a common government, they are likely to express themselves in political or legal action, or in some other relatively peaceful way. Only when they occur between men living under separate sovereignities is war likely to be resorted to. War can therefore be ruled out by the establishment of a common government for all men, a world federation with power to enact and enforce laws commanding world order and security. This is merely an application on a world scale of the third definition of peace. As we have seen, this peace is defined as public order and security commanded by the laws of a government. On a world scale this means that world peace is world order and security commanded by the laws of a world government.

The effective peace program, the "whole" man, must work at all three kinds.

Reprinted by the World Without War Council

4.23.76

What Is Conscience?

Conscience is usually defined as the capacity to make moral judgments about *one's own* actions. It is purely subjective in nature, and operationally can be described as that inner force which compels a person to do or to refuse to do something. Since the origins are so interior, there is no necessary relation between conscience and truth, or love, or honesty. Opposing values can be conscientious expressions of the holders. In itself, conscience is not necessarily socially beneficial.

This definition has, through the years, been modified by the addition of certain limiting attributes. Thus, the primary motive is never personal gain. Also, when men act conscientiously and are utterly convinced of the morality or "correctness" of their positions, many frequently have no hesitation in forcing it on others. Conscience is no respector of majority rule or the goals of other people. Further, it is not rational in the sense that it is necessarily a conscious development deriving directly from logic, reason, wisdom and experience. Rather, conscience is value oriented and stems from the totality of the person. The ultimate test of a conscientious belief is sincerity, and the ultimate test of sincerity is the extent of suffering the conscientious person is willing to endure.

A list of people whom history has highlighted as conscientious would include the Hebrew Prophets, the Buddha, the human Jesus, Sir Thomas More, Martin Luther, Giordano Bruno and Gandhi. But even some of the less attractive actions of Hitler and Stalin could be called conscientious. A classic example of the opposition of conscientious beliefs is represented by the Greek myth of Antigone and her uncle, Creon.

A society cannot possibly know, in any immediate way, whether a conscientious position is "right" for it. What "right" is, is itself a definitional problem. Do we know even today whether Martin Luther was "right"? We know only that he did what he felt he had to do, that his actions found resonances in others, and that as a result a whole religious and cultural system was overturned. The only "right" thing we are certain of is that his positions had extensive popular support, presumably from people who also acted out of conscience.

How then is a society to deal with individuals who refuse to follow accustomed norms, claiming conscience as the reason? In a democracy, the obvious simple answer is to be permissive and to tolerate such acts so long as they do not impinge on the rights of others to do what they conscientiously feel they should do, and so long as such acts do not threaten the existence of the society. In the main, this is the American position.

What happens, however, when an increasing number of people claim conscience for refusing certain obligations imposed by the state, and when that number grows so great as to threaten established customs? The three obvious options are to muddle through somehow, to change society so that the asserted conscientious positions become the norm, or to enforce existing standards.

Excerpted and adapted from an article, "Conscience and War: The Moral Dilemma." (1969) Reprinted with permission of the author, Charles Bloomstein.

7.7.80

The Individual and Society

The ethos of democracy stresses the worth and dignity of each individual, but the growing complexity of society each year seems to demand increasing central regulation. The resultant tension between the rights of the individual and the obligation of the state to protect all its citizens has never been resolved. There is an extensive literature on the subject dating from ancient times, but there is no clear-cut definition on which all can agree as to where individual rights end and societal duties begin.

It is important to understand that this tension between the individual and his society has no necessary political coloration. Many assume that the pressure for more individual freedom comes from liberals and radicals, but this is not always the case. In fact, in many instances, the liberals and radicals have called for greater centralization and regulation, while the conservatives support "laissez-faire" policies and the rights of individuals. The struggle for "states rights," for example, is an effort to curb centralization.

In a complex democracy of 200,000,000 people, there is bound to be great diversity of modes of thought, customs, desires and personal needs. On the whole, our society seems to have been tolerant of (even encouraging and accommodating) this diversity. Conflicts arise when an individual, or a group of individuals, jeopardizes the rights of others, endangers others or endangers the state. But standards for such judgments are ill-defined and subject to varying interpretations, so that no sure, firm guidelines exist. On some matters, for example, the Board of the American Civil Liberties Union has been unable to agree.

It is relatively easy to define circumstances where individual freedom must be limited—such as traffic regulations. But Prohibition was an area in which there was so much disagreement that something as difficult to achieve as a Constitutional amendment had to be repealed. We are now also seeing great differences of opinion about nonaddictive drugs like marijuana. There is also a growing body of opinion demanding coercive legislation on pollutants and environmental controls. Individual and corporate freedom is constantly being redefined through changing public opinion.

On the one hand, therefore, the basic commitment to individual freedom requires constant expansion of individual rights. On the other, demands which others regard as excessive and as threatening the public good or their own freedom invite repression. Recent elections have been won and lost on the issue of law and order, and in many cases the references are not to well-defined criminal behavior but to attempts to change institutions and effect social change through what must be considered by any stable society unacceptable methods.

There is another tension here. Quite obviously, an urgent priority of any society is stability and self-perpetuation. Yet, we know that societies must change and that the way must be open for desirable changes to occur as they become recognized as needed. For this to happen, there must be continuous pressure for such change, and it follows automatically that the initial pressures for any specific change are premature. Further, most people believe that too much change too fast will result in chaos, and this becomes another limiting factor.

Those who seek change make a choice of means based on their perception of the society. If they see it as relatively open and providing effective channels for processing change, the means selected tend to be nonviolent and therefore more socially acceptable. If they see the society as rigid and impermeable, then violence and revolution seem the only valid choice. In sum, the more democratic the society, the more those who seek to change it can and should work through existing institutions.

Despite these tensions there is a general and growing recognition that wherever possible each individual must be permitted to follow his own conscience. Nowhere is the conflict in democracy clearer than in the area of conscientious objection to war. Here the demands of the state, the rule of the majority, and sometimes even the very existence of the society can depend on a unity of purpose and action which the conscientious objector would reject. For example, how would any nation react should the number of objectors rise so alarmingly that it would prove impossible to maintain and supply an armed force for its defense? If the society was not ready to adopt alternative foreign policies and defenses, and if the objectors constituted a very substantial minority, it is possible that social order could break down and perhaps destroy the very democracy which both the majority and the minority seek to preserve.

An exacerbating feature here is the Nuremberg trials held after World War II, in which not only was guilt for the war pinned on the Germans, but individuals obeying "illegal" orders from their superiors were deemed to have committed war crimes. In a very real way, this puts the conscript in an intolerable position. He cannot refuse to obey an order from a superior (and most men cannot be expected to be able to distinguish a lawful from an unlawful order in a complex technological society where pushing a button is all that may be demanded of them) and yet he may later be subject to trial and conviction. This is a simplified view of what actually was decided at Nuremberg, but it is the popular one. It has affected large numbers of young people, and it is today being used as an argument for refusing to serve in the armed forces.

There is also the problem of those persons not subject to the draft who feel the compulsions of conscience with respect to how their society is acting in one field or another. Scientists have refused to work on weaponry, some people have refused to pay taxes for war (echoing Henry David Thoreau), others have felt compelled to take extreme positions on racial issues, and a few are now planning direct action on matters of environmental control. While these acts of conscience are not central to the immediate problems of draft-age men, they are relevant and an integral part of any study of conscience and the demands of society.

RESPONSE OUTSIDE EXISTING INSTITUTIONS

It is clear that the moral problem of the limits of individual obedience to establish authority has not been eliminated by majority rule. There exist "no compromise" issues of a moral or political nature involving conscience—racial segregation, slavery, inhumane violations of a minority's rights, and so forth—which do not become acceptable because of majority sanction. Abolition of religious liberty by the majority, for example, will not bind the religious. As far as the individual is concerned, when it is demanded that he submit to what he believes to be a violation of his basic beliefs, it makes little difference to him whether the evil is one approved by a single ruler or by all the rest of his fellow citizens. One of the sobering aspects of politics is the number of occasions in history when a government's laws and policies have, in the perspective of later years, been condemned as having been wrong. The simple extension of the franchise is no guarantee against gross injustice.

Political violence is one alternative for those who believe a society incapable of peaceful change. It is also, alas, the first resort of those temperamentally suited to violence and/or lacking the will or ability to propose rational solutions to social problems. Those violent revolutionaries whose efforts have "helped" the human race, were very few in number. Their revolutions were last, not first, resorts and had little to do with personal incapacity to function within a social group.

Withdrawal, or passivity, in its rejection of social commitment, is another choice, but one which expresses profound pessimism. One argument for withdrawal is that history provides examples of scientists, philosophers and artists who consciously remained uninvolved in periods of political chaos, and saved for posterity records and achievements not otherwise possible. Those who withdraw or choose violence are, however, most often those about whom history hears nothing.

There is another alternative for *extreme* objectors—deliberate, peaceful and public violation of particular laws, decrees, regulations, ordinances and military or police orders—in effect, civil disobedience. The laws selected to be violated should be those regarded as inherently immoral, unjust or tyrannical. This method is practiced as a nonviolent way of responding to conflicts and of expressing extreme dissent while recognizing the democratic rights of the majority. Integral to it is respect for the concept of law and open and willing acceptance of the penalties. Its roots are deep in democratic theory.

A given policy can be changed by nonviolent means only by converting the majority to accept the desirability of that change. Such majority support can be gained, in part, through "witnessing." The example of individuals willing to undergo penalties and hardships for their conscientious dissent may lead increasing numbers of the public to think about the issues for the first time. Also, the government is compelled to provide the necessary enforcement personnel, administrative machinery and punishment facilities to cope with the dissenters. Hence, nonviolent resisters accept the penalties imposed on them and regard those penalties as a means of coercing others into facing the issues and deciding how far they want to go in enforcement.

Excerpted and adapted from an article, "Conscience and War: The Moral Dilemma." (1969) Reprinted with permission of the author, Charles Bloomstein.

Religious and Philosophical Approaches to War

Most civilizations have produced strong moral and legal injunctions against the taking of life. This has meant that the resort to war has required special justification. With the slow growth of personal freedom and the concept or personal responsibility, especially in the West, individuals have found it necessary to consider two basic questions: Under what circumstances is it immoral to wage war? Under what circumstances is it immoral not to wage war? There are a variety of philosophical and religious positions which enable individuals to answer these questions for themselves. Again, without trying to be exhaustive, some of the dominant themes are presented below.

PACIFISM

Pacifism, like conscience, yields to no rigid definition. During the 19th century it described "a principle or policy of establishing and maintaining universal peace or such relations among nations that all differences may be adjusted without recourse to war." This definition did not exclude participation in war if the avenues of peaceful resolution failed. In the 20th century, however, the term "pacifism" acquired a narrower content and is now used almost exclusively to describe those persons who will not, under any conditions, support or participate in any war.

Still, the pacifist conscience cannot be limited to a single theory of nonresistance to violence or aggression. There are many interpretations, viewpoints, approaches and expressions ranging from absolute personal pacifism to acceptance of a police force but rejection of organized violence by the state. Pacifism is an imprecise term that embraces varying types and shades of opposition to war and violence.

It is impossible in the space available to characterize all shades of pacifist thought in detail, especially since many nonpacifists frequently share some or most of the pacifist's convictions. With this in mind, the following commentary is presented as a thumbnail sketch—more for the purpose of delineating basic concepts than to serve as a primer on pacifist theory.

Traditional Religious Pacifism

For the first 200 years after Jesus, no Christian was permitted to be a soldier. But by 400 A.D. no non-Christian could be a Roman soldier. The original pacifist content of Christianity has since been latent, but has found much fresh vigor since the Protestant Reformation. The Quakers, Mennonites and Brethren are pacifist in their doctrinal positions and are now known as the historic peace churches. The Amish, Doukhobors and others, including the recently formed Bruderhof, are also pacifist. While some of these denominations are quite fundamentalist in approach, others, like the Quakers, are on the whole liberal. But all believe firmly that Jesus was a complete pacifist and that the imitation of Christ is the highest human endeavor. There are Jews, Buddhists and even nonreligious pacifists whose views on war are essentially the same as those of Christian pacifists.

Gandhian Pacifism

There is a tendency to view all pacifists as similar and to argue that they are unrealistic or irrelevant because they have no program for social change and the elimination of injustice. While this is true of some inner-directed pacifists, it is particularly not applicable to Gandhians. Gandhi never developed his ideas into a single coherent statement, but some of his concepts provide practical tools for thinking about social justice and ending war. A brief outline follows:

Conflict: In contrast to those pacifists who believe that any form of conflict is evil, Gandhi argued that conflict was an essential element of living, was useful and often good. The problem was to find means for resolving conflict which were creative and humanizing rather than destructive and brutalizing.

Truth: Whereas love is the core idea in Christian pacifism, truth was the core idea to Gandhi. By truth he meant that reality which human beings can *agree* on as their common condition and common need. Truth requires agreement, while violence and war destroy humans and prevent agreement. Striving for truth requires nonviolence.

Constructive Program: Nonviolence means not only not hurting others but also positive good will. An essential element of nonviolence is a constructive social and material program, necessary not only for itself but also as a means of demonstrating good intentions to opponents.

Self-Suffering: Gandhi believed in accepting punishment as a means of forcing those inflicting that punishment to review their own beliefs and to decide whether they really wanted to carry out such punishment. In order for this to work, one's own good intentions, honesty and truthfulness had to be apparent to all. The voluntary acceptance of suffering can operate as a coercive force, but creatively rather than violently.

Social Change: Gandhi agreed with most social observers that there is an interrelationship between the consciousness and morality of people and their social institutions; that both people and institutions need to be changed, but that real change can occur only as an interaction between these elements. Those who seek to perfect themselves apart from society are doomed to futility, as are those who would deal only with social institutions.

Means and Ends: Gandhi did not make any distinction between ends and means, and believed that not only are these inseparable, but that the means used actually determine the ends achieved. If the goal is a peaceful society, it can be built only through nonviolence.

The Individual: The world contains many different societies because people have made them different. But all institutions require the consent and cooperation of the individuals involved. By withholding consent, people can force institutions to change.

Power: Gandhi believed that violence is one expression of power, but there are many other types of power more humane and effective. The power of ideas, of love, of work, of competence, of knowledge, of cooperation are all available to the man who foregoes violence.

Philosophical Pacifists

Many consider anarchists as bomb throwers and lovers of chaos. There is also a very different, less well known, tradition of anarchism which believes that order can be created only by the building of voluntary nonviolent cooperative relations among people. Pacifist anarchists are opposed to most aspects of the state, which they see as the institutionalization of violence and force. They therefore refuse cooperation with the draft. However, they do not believe in the use of violence to destroy the state. Rather, like the Gandhians, and to some extent the conservatives, they argue that the "revolution" occurs when people change themselves, act differently and voluntarily take care of themselves and their neighbors.

There are also those who become pacifists out of a philosophical approach and who see nonviolence as the only means of achieving the good life not only for themselves but for all men. They accept, like the Christians, many religious moral values. They accept, like the Gandhians, many of the Mahatma's teachings, including the inseparability of ends and means. They have many of the same suspicions of the state as the pacifist anarchists. Essentially, they are eclectic, and each builds his own philosophy out of many historic supporting strands.

THE JUST WAR THEORY

Various criteria for distinguishing between just and unjust war have been formulated by Augustine, the Medieval Scholastics, St. Thomas Aquinas, John Calvin, Charles Montesquieu, John Stuart Mill and more recently by men like Karl Barth, Reinhold Niebuhr and Paul Ramsey. In most cases, consideration is given both to the goals to be achieved by a particular war and the means employed. The following, formulated by Edward L. Long, in his book *War and Conscience in America*, are some conditions theologians have generally felt should obtain for a war to be considered just:

— "Resort to arms can be regarded as legitimate only when all other means to the morally just solution of the conflict are exhausted."

— "War can be just only if employed to defend a stable order or morally preferable cause against threats of destruction or the rise of injustice."

— "A war must be carried out with the right attitudes." A war's ultimate purpose must be to establish the conditions for peace and justice.

— "A just war may be conducted only by military means that promise a reasonable chance of attainment of the moral and political objectives being sought."

— A just war requires a "proportionality between evil to be done and good to be achieved." The just war theorist must therefore pose not only the question of when it is immoral to wage war but also the question of when it is immoral not to wage war. According to Paul Ramsey, ". . . of all the tests for judging whether to resort to or participate in war, this one of balancing an evil or good effect against another is open to the greatest uncertainty. This, therefore, establishes rather than removes the possibility of conscientious disagreement among prudent men."

— ". . . just or limited warfare must be *forces-counter-forces* warfare, and *people-counter-people* warfare is wholly unjust." This prohibition is particularly difficult to observe today, with the distinction between combatant and citizen increasingly hard to determine.

Just war theory remains only theory, since no international system of law and juridical order exists capable of rendering and enforcing judgments on particular wars. The League of Nations, the Nuremberg Tribunals and the United Nations have been steps in this direction, but no international authority has yet been able to declare a war just

or unjust and then enforce its decision. Each individual is left to decide for himself or accept an authority's judgment. If a war is just, it follows that it is immoral not to support it—therefore, one must be a conscientious warrior. If unjust, a conscientious objector.

Just war theory, Roman Catholic in origin, is now popular among many non-Catholics and even among those not at all religious, since it does raise the issues involved in judging whether a war is moral or immoral. Some claim that no war can be just in today's world. Others are willing to concede the possibility of a just war. Although formulated in religious terms, the just war theory is, in effect, a basis for selective objection or participation in a particular war.

THE CRUSADING WAR

Another attitude toward war comes to us from the religious crusade. While crusades occurred in antiquity and are also part of the history of religions other than Christianity (notably Islam), it is within the context of Christianity that the crusading ethic of war developed its significance to the Western world.

The Augustinian doctrine of the just war was subjected to radically new demands as the political order of the Roman Empire disintegrated. Instead of stressing the permissibility of war only as a defensive measure in the protection of a Christian state, Medieval Scholastics justified offensive war as a vindication of an injury to life or honor. As church and state merged, war was no longer considered inherently incompatible with the spirit of Christ.

In 1095, at the Council of Clermont, Pope Urban II introduced a new premise upon which war could be waged. Calling on the members of the assembly to end their fratricidal conflicts, the Pope called for the wresting of Palestine from an "accursed race" and "unclean nation"—the infidels. Thus were launched the Christian Crusades.

The motivation behind any crusading war is ideological: crusades are fought in the name of religion; in the name of Freedom "to make the world safe for democracy"; in the name of Marx "to carry the Socialist revolution through to the end"; and so forth.

Crusading war calls for unyielding and extremist attitudes. The slogan "better dead than red" became a popular cold war shorthand expression for the preference many Americans share, to die fighting for democracy rather than be forced to live under an alien ideology. In Spain, in 1936, it was said, "It is better to die on your feet than live on your knees."

The crusading war ethic justifies war either as ennobling to the nation and the human spirit or as the only possible way to achieve glorious and desirable goals. In such a war ideals are the real antagonists, and the "higher level of truth" *ultimately* must always win. Nietzsche wrote, "What does it matter if life be sacrificed so long as truth be realized?" Hitler believed that the death of a soldier fighting for the fatherland was the ultimate experience open to man.

The crusading war imposes few constraints and sometimes exults in the unrestrained use of force. Hitler's solution to the "Jewish problem" and Stalin's mass "liquidations" become rational once the ideal end is accepted as necessary by whatever means. The enemy is not simply wrong but considered nonhuman, and methods used to liquidate such enemies do not, therefore, fall under moral strictures still binding among real human beings. Among these enemies are those opposed to the crusade and those who support the other side.

Those who believe in the idealistic goals of a crusade are perforce also conscientious warriors. For them not to participate in such a war would be immoral.

POLITICAL WARS

The crusading war, originally religious in origin, now finds its counterpart in the political field. Wars are supported or opposed as they conform to the political goals and values of the societies involved. World War II was "popular" because it was seen from both the religious and political viewpoint as absolutely essential to the preservation of the values of freedom, individual worth and democracy. These are political as well as religious values.

But political motivations can also lead to selective opposition or support of one side of a particular war. Thus, some who oppose the U.S. intervention in Vietnam actually support the objectives of the Vietcong, the military arm of the Vietnamese National Liberation Front. Some who oppose the violence of Israel support the Arab states, and vice versa. Political objection to one side in a war is not objection to all war. It is actually selective objection, which sees some wars (or some sides of some wars) as wrong, others as desirable. Again, depending on one's political convictions, one can become a conscientious objector or a conscientious warrior.

PREEMPTIVE WAR

Carry the analysis to the extreme, it is conceivable that the only

way a nation can preserve itself and its values is to attack an opponent nation in order to prevent that opponent from marshalling and using its own armed forces for aggressive purposes. The Six Day War[2] in 1967 is a clear example of this conviction. Containing elements of both just war theory and the crusading war, a logical and rational case can be made for this kind of war. Those who subscribe to this case will again find themselves conscientious warriors.

1. Most often this term is reserved to describe those who oppose all war.

2. Fought in the Middle-East.

Excerpted and adapted from an article, "Conscience and War: The Moral Dilemma." (1969) Reprinted with permission of the author, Charles Bloomstein.

Selective Service And You

What is the Selective Service System?

It's a government agency which will provide people for the Armed Forces in the event of a national emergency. Since the start of the All Volunteer Force in 1973, it has been in a "standby" position. However, Selective Service must be ready to respond immediately in time of need. The purpose of registration is to improve this ability.

How Will You Register?

If you are required to register, go to the nearest United States Post Office*, pick up a form, fill it in, and hand it to a postal clerk who will check your form with an identification, such as your driver's license. The postal clerk will not give you a receipt. However, you will later receive a verification letter from Selective Service.

Please note that postal clerks* are not familiar with the details of the Selective Service System. They can only help you in filling out the Registration Form. If you have questions that this pamphlet doesn't answer, write to the Selective Service System, 600 E Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20435.

After You Have Registered, What Happens?

The information you have given us will be put into our files. You will be sent a copy of that information to be sure it is correct. If the information about you is wrong, please change it on the form supplied to you and mail it back to us. You will not be issued a registration card, but you should keep your verification letter as proof of your registration. If you do not receive a verification letter within 90 days, you should write Selective Service at 600 E Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20435.

* If you are living or visiting overseas, go to the nearest U.S. Embassy or Consular office where consular personnel will assist you in registration.

Published by
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM
600 E STREET N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20435

Information Brochure No. 10 Apr 1980

What If You Move?

The law requires you to let us know if you move. Simply mail us your new address on a Change of Information form which you can get at your nearest Post Office, U.S. Embassy or Consular Office.

Will There Be A Draft?

There are no plans at this time for a draft. No one has been drafted in the U.S. since 1972. A draft could not begin unless the Congress decides that it is needed. The purpose of registration is to have the names and addresses of those who might be called in the event a draft should become necessary, as in a national emergency. With this file of names and addresses, processing could begin quickly and smoothly.

Who Would Be Selected For Induction?

If you are not already a member of an armed service—active, reserve or National Guard—you could be selected through a lottery based upon the date of your birth. People selected for induction would be sent a letter of instructions which would explain their rights and responsibilities.

If A Draft Begins, What Are Your Rights?

The law says you should report for examination and induction if you are ordered to do so.

You may request a postponement, deferment or exemption. For example:

- ☐ If you are a student in college, you may finish the semester; if a senior, you may finish the year.
- ☐ If you are a high school student, you may stay in school until you graduate (up to age 20).
- ☐ If your induction would create a hardship to your dependents, you may ask for a deferment.
- ☐ If you are a student studying for the ministry, you may request a deferment.

- ☐ If you are a minister of religion, you may request an exemption.
- ☐ If you have deeply-held religious, moral, or ethical beliefs against participation in war in any form, you could request status as a conscientious objector. If found to be a conscientious objector and depending upon your specific beliefs, you will be required to serve either in a non-combatant position in the Armed Forces or in a civilian public service job (for example, in a hospital).

How Do You File A Claim?

Instructions on how to file a claim will be included with letters of induction. You would fill out the form for postponement or reclassification and send it to Selective Service.

What Happens When You File A Claim?

You will be given the chance to present information to support your claim to a local draft board. You can be assisted in this by counselors, family members, clergy, and any other person you may want.

You could not be drafted until you are offered all of your appeal rights under the law.

Who Makes These Decisions?

Your claim would be considered by local draft board members. These people will be from your community.

Who Would Be Most Likely To Be Called In The Event Of A Draft?

Those who reach their 20th birthday in the calendar year of the draft will be the first group to be called. Others would be called as necessary.

SOME QUESTIONS AND SOME ANSWERS *

WHEN AND WHERE DO I REGISTER?

If you were born in 1962, you must register in January 1981. If you were born in 1963 or later, you must register within 30 days of your 18th birthday.

The registration procedure requires that you go to your local post office and fill out a registration form. The form will ask your name, address (both permanent and temporary if you have both), your birthday and your social security number. (The social security will be used as the military identification number replacing the serial number previously used.) If you wish to have your name sent to the armed services recruitment offices, you can check a box that indicates your interest in receiving information from them. These forms will be sent to the national Selective Service Office for processing.

WILL I BE GIVEN A DRAFT CARD?

You will receive a notice that Selective Service has received your registration form but you will not be issued a draft card. Previously, when men registered, they filled out forms so that they could be classified as available for service, deferred for a specific reason, exempted from service or classified as unfit for induction. The system has been changed. There is no classification procedure included in the registration.

WHAT IF I REFUSE TO REGISTER OR JUST DON'T BOTHER TO DO SO?

Failure to register is a felony. The maximum penalty calls for five years in prison and $10,000 fine.

IF I HAVE A DISABILITY, AM I REQUIRED TO REGISTER?

Yes, all young men are required to register at age 18.

ALTHOUGH I LIVE IN THE UNITED STATES, I AM NOT A CITIZEN. DO I HAVE TO REGISTER?

Most aliens, who are permanent residents, are required to register. A few are not. Check with the Selective Service Office with regard to your status. (Selective Service is listed in the phone book under United States Government.)

WHEN WILL I KNOW MY SELECTIVE SERVICE CLASSIFICATION?

If the Congress votes to re-instate a draft, there will be regulations announced regarding classification. Those who wish to request a deferment or an exemption will have the opportunity to do so.

* These questions and answers refer to young men. Women are not included in the registration.

WILL I BE DRAFTED THIS COMING YEAR?

At present (summer, 1980), there is no draft. It is uncertain whether Congress will pass a draft law.

WHAT IS THE MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT (MSSA)?

Under our legislative system, Congress passes a law and then must vote again to appropriate money to implement it (if money is needed to do so). The U.S. Constitution states that "no appropriation of money to that use [armed service] shall be made for a longer term than two years". The MSSA is the Congressional legislation authorizing the President to register and induct men into the armed forces. This law was first passed in 1948 and has been amended as needed since that time. In 1973, the Congress did not appropriate money for a draft. The draft was simply allowed to lapse and we have not had conscription since that time. Registration was discontinued in 1975 when the President did not request appropriations for that purpose. The law passed in June, 1980 was an appropriations bill for registration only. Now men are required to register with the Selective Service Office. There is no draft.

WHAT IS THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM (SSS)?

The SSS is the federal agency that is responsible for administering the MSSA. Its policies are determined by law (MSSA), executive regulations, Defense Department recommendations regarding manpower needs, and education and medical standards (determined by the Army) to be applied in order to reject those individuals considered unfit for induction. The SSS has a National Director, who reports to the President, Regional Directors and local draft boards.

WHAT IF I BELIEVE THAT IT WOULD BE MORALLY WRONG FOR ME TO PARTICIPATE IN WAR AND/OR SERVE IN THE ARMED FORCES?

The law provides for no exemptions from registration. The law does exempt from combat training and service individuals who for reasons of conscience oppose all war. These men must register. In case of a draft, they may request a conscientious objector (CO) classification. If granted, they are required to do alternative service.The individual, classified as I-O,must perform service in the national interest under civilian supervision. The one, classified I-A-O, must serve as a non-combatant in the armed services.

Some people oppose participation in some wars but not all war. Others believe that any cooperation with the military system is morally wrong and refuse to register. Selective Service law does not give legal recognition to the selective conscientious objector (the former) nor to the noncooperator (the latter). These people face the choice of violating their consciences by submitting to induction (in case of a draft) or to registration or of disobeying the law and accepting the consequences of this.

WHAT RIGHT DOES THE GOVERNMENT HAVE TO DRAFT MEN INTO THE ARMED FORCES?

The right of the government is defended on two counts:

1. The U.S. Constitution gives the Congress the power to make laws to provide for the common defense. The President is designated Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces. In practice this has come to mean that the Congress enacts laws government military manpower procurement (MSSA). The President sets up the machinery for inducting men into the armed services (SSS). Most people in our country accept both the law and the system and see them as legitimate expressions of the duties described in the Constitution.

Two of the groups that argue against the constitutionality of the MSSA and the SSS are the American Civil Liberties Union and the Libertarian Party.

2. In a democratic constitutional governmental system, such as we have, the judgment of the majority holds unless it impinges upon those rights of individuals and minorities that are protected by law or in the Constitution. Most Americans agree that the duties of the citizen include sharing responsibility for the common defense. They argue that the government has the right to make laws that require compulsory military service to protect our country and its interests. Those who wish to change those laws should seek to persuade the majority and work through institutional channels to alter or abolish the law.

Some disagree and believe that the government does not have the right to require compulsory service. Citizens must contribute to the community but the Government should not compell them to perform certain specific services. These people would oppose a compulsory national service, even one that does not include military service.

Others would support government policy that required conscription in times of national emergency but oppose a draft now for a variety of reasons. (A peacetime draft leads to militarism. The U.S. government is controlled by a military-industrial-complex seeking to protect the wealthy elite. Etc.)

SHOULD I REGISTER? SHOULD I REPORT FOR DUTY IF I AM CALLED?

These are decisions you should make. They are not easy decisions for the problems that war and military service pose are difficult ones.

prepared by the World Education Center
c/o The World Without War Council
1730 Grove Street
Berkeley, CA 94709 415/845-1992

6.80

ANALYZING POINTS OF VIEW ON THE DRAFT

This section contains a few examples of the ways in which different groups respond to the question: Should the U.S. require compulsory military service? A vote on the draft is a simple yes or no. But a point of view is a "Yes, because..." or a "No, but...". It is in the "because's" and the "but's" that we encounter the fundamental differences between groups expressed in basic assumptions, beliefs, values and purposes. These are the contexts out of which the groups make their judgments about the problems of conscience and war and the specific issue of the draft.

The following questions are designed to help young people understand and evaluate different positions on the draft. The first five questions are clarifying ones. The remaining two are for evaluation.

Questions for understanding:

1. What does the group/organization wish to achieve? in the short-run? in the long-run?
2. What relationship does the organization believe exists between peace and the draft? (What are the key obstacles to peace? How are they to be overcome?)
3. Does the organization believe that war is ever justified? If so, for what reasons and under what conditions? If not, does the group believe that any action can or should be taken if people or a nation is threatened by another nation or an oppressive government?
4. According to the organization, does the individual have responsibilities to the political community? If yes, what are some of these responsibilities? Do they include military service?
5. What does the organization seek to preserve, protect and promote? What does the group ignore or consider of little value?

Questions for evaluation:

1. What are some arguments that challenge this position?
2. Do you agree with this organization's point of view? If so, what are your reasons? If not, what do you think?

Prepared by the World Education Center
c/o The World Without War Council
1730 Grove Street
Berkeley, CA 94709

6.80

On March 16, 1980, a group of faculty and students of three Midwestern colleges affiliated with the historic peace churches met to formulate a statement concerning their opposition to the impending compulsory military registration. Their statement, which was signed by 18 people, is as follows:

We approach this position from our denominations' historical opposition to war, and we are compelled to state unequivocally our complete opposition to reinstatement of any form of military registration. We find, from our faith, that violence is inherently contradictory to the teachings of Christ and our acceptance of those teachings, and feel that registration is one step further towards an attitude that accepts violence as a legitimate solution to the world's problems. We favor alternative approaches to peacemaking that seek reconciliation rather than revenge, and encourage and support those, who by conscience, resist militarization. We have included further considerations that bear direct relationship to the issue of registration and the draft.

In the event of registration and/or classification, we respect responses of integrity--ones which have been searched out and sensitized individually and collectively in terms of conviction and faith. However, because we value all of life, and because we believe that war violates this conviction, we particularly encourage the responses of conscientious objection and non-registration, pledging our support to persons who make these responses.

We believe that church and private voluntary service must be available as an option for conscientious objectors, since service in this form is motivated by Christian love as opposed to the government coercion inherent in national service. Church and private voluntary service provides an opportunity to witness against militarism, and we are especially concerned that we not be required to indirectly support any war effort. We believe that national service is an intrusion on our efforts to remain separate from the militarism of the government. We also believe that national service is an attempt to exert control on our lives to an extent we feel belongs only to God. We believe that a church or private voluntary service should be equitable with national service in terms of hardship, duration and restriction of personal liberties, but that the end result of that service be life affirming and violence rejecting. We feel that complete separation of private and church voluntary service from national service is imperative for defining and maintaining this distinction.

Separation of the authority of God and state is a principle derived from the historic stands of the peace churches. We call upon all college and schools of our denominations to refuse to become too closely allied with the enforcement arm of the state. Specifically, we call upon them to refuse any giving of lists of students or general opening of student files to government or police officials, especially for the purpose of selective service registration or the seeking of draft or registration resisters. We believe that not only traditional theological stands support this but also civil libertarian considerations in the liberal arts tradition.

Given the traditional stance of our denominations, we call upon our colleges to refuse to display military literature or allow military recruitment on their campuses.

PEACE CONCERNS

There is no longer any pretence. War fever has struck America. What began as ominous rumblings in November has become the unmistakable thunder of the gearing up of the Pentagon's terrible juggernaut of death and destruction. How have we reached this stage only seven short years after the debacle in Vietnam? What is the appropriate Christian response?

While the American public may have recoiled from the Southeast Asian experience with a distaste for war, the U.S. government has never retreated in the last decade from its reliance on the force of arms. Military spending has continued to spiral upward in quantum leaps. The Hatfield nuclear moratorium amendment to the SALT II treaty was never given serious consideration in Congress -- and now, of course, the arms limitation talks themselves have fallen by the wayside. We have continued with the development of the first-strike M-X missile system, cruise missiles, and Trident-II submarines. We are preparing to place mid-range nuclear weapons in Europe. The decade of the seventies was one of arming for war, not a time of working for peace.

Popular opposition to the war in Indochina did teach the American leadership one important lesson: the U.S. could not intervene militarily without the support of our country. Teddy Roosevelt had his "Maine"; F.D.R. his Pearl Harbor. The embassy takeover in November was not enough to light the American war fires, but it certainly provided ready fuel. The media stirred the embers by directing national outrage at Khomeini and the students instead of towards the Shah or our decades of support of his repressive regime. We were not allowed to look at the Iranians as human beings and ask why they were angry at us, and if perhaps we are deserving of their outrage.

> Conscientious Objector (CO) status is an alternative to military action for those whose beliefs about war prohibit participation in the armed forces. The Church has supported this stance in various documents.
>
> It is urgent that a young person who wishes to file as a CO begin to prepare NOW. Churches can play a key role in guiding and supporting the young person of strong moral stance. Contact OCPJ or a draft counselor for more information.

Instead, the already present anti-Arab feelings, which had focused on OPEC since the oil crisis of 1973, were intensified and channelled toward the people of Iran (which is ironic in that Iranians are not Arabs, and have been historical rivals of the Arabian peoples). Johnny Carson, that late-night barometer of American opinion, began aiming his pointed barbs at the Ayatollah Khomeini and began making draft-status jokes. More and more World War II movies began creeping into the late show lineup (a coincidence, perhaps?). To support the president, and thus the movement toward military preparedness, has been touted as patriotism; anyone who opposes the war effort is therefore labeled "unpatriotic."

With President Carter's State-of-the-Union reference to reinstatement of draft registration -- the first "official" phase of war mobilization -- the United States has announced to a not-surprised world our readiness to fight. Once again, attempts at a peaceful solution to international conflicts has apparently failed (although there may yet remain a glimmer of hope -- if the public speaks up now).

Why have we again turned to the force of arms instead of the "force of love"? It is not too late to examine alternative solutions (see box for one specific non-violent alternative). As Christians, we must stop and prayerfully examine our options. Calling to mind Christ's challenge "blessed are the peacemakers," we may come to the painful conclusion that we cannot blindly follow our political leaders down the road to the horrible holocaust of modern war.

Reprinted with permission from the Oregon Center on Peace and Justice.

The Daily Californian Monday, January 28, 1980
OPINION
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

If the third world war comes

With the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan providing a convenient excuse, the U.S. government — in alliance with much of the press — is preparing the American public for a third world war.

A new flock of born-again hawks have appeared in the nation's capital — with President Carter at the forefront. They are molding public sentiment, whipping up patriotic fervor, and organizing the world's capitalists for an assault on their historic arch enemy: communism.

NINA EASTON

Carter, for his part, is exploiting the situation in Afghanistan to the fullest. He has announced he is reinstituting registration for the draft, threatened to boycott the Olympics, halted grain shipments to the U.S.S.R., limited cultural and scientific exchanges, cancelled plans for a Soviet consulate and dispatched naval reinforcements to the Middle East region.

Support for Carter's measures among the Washington elite is evident. Former CIA deputy director for intelligence Ray Cline warns, "We are already in the early stages of war," California Senator Alan Cranston is quoted as saying a Soviet move into Iran almost certainly would mean World War III.

Even Senator George McGovern, a leading opponent of the Vietnam War, says it "would be war if (the Soviets) went into Iran. With all that oil . . . I don't think we would permit that."

This isn't the first time the hawks have tried to spark a third world war. They tried five years ago in Angola, and they tried when Vietnam invaded Cambodia last year. But Americans' hearts just weren't into it: these were neatly contained superpower struggles, employing native troops, confined to native regions. The hawks even tried to go to war by fabricating a crisis in Cuba last summer, suddenly "discovering" a contingent of 3,000 Soviet troops there.

But the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan by some 30,000-100,000 troops has provided the ideal setting for generating public support for war. Not only did it signify expansion of the Soviet model of communism, the presence of Soviet troops could harm U.S. oil interests by threatening the stability of the pro-U.S. Pakistani regime and by providing support to leftist factions in revolutionary Iran.

No one quite seems to know why the Soviets invaded Afghanistan. The U.S. government seems to think the troops are on their way to Iran. Much of the press uses the time-worn and false theory that the Soviets are fulfilling a centuries-old quest for a warm water port. (Does this mean the troops will leave once they discover Afghanistan is landlocked?) Leonid Brezhnev claims the invasion was launched to stave off Western imperialists who are hungry for the region's oil.

With detente on its death bed and an alliance between the Soviets' two embittered foes, the U.S. and China in the works, and with a U.S. invasion of Iran over the hostage crisis in the offing, the Soviets may have felt the need to flex a little muscle. Unfortunately, however, their display was ill-timed. After all, this is an election year and Ameri'-can politicians do like to gain support at home by flapping their wings abroad.

ill-timed. After all, this is an election year and American politicians do like to gain support at home by flapping their wings abroad.

But perhaps the Soviet Union's biggest mistake was tactical. Mass invasion is out of style these days

— hence the nearly unanimous denunciation of the U.S.S.R. by the U.N. General Assembly. A CIA-type intrigue, coupled with arming sympathetic insurgents and/or sending in proxy troops, is much more avant-garde. At least those actions could be denied in official circles. The Soviet Union's onslaught was not only crude and old-fashioned, it was excessive. Leonid and his cohorts really should take a few lessons in imperialism from the United States.

It's easy for the U.S. war machine to shirk the blame for increasing East-West tension, to scream that we tried detente, but the Soviets just can't be trusted. But the U.S. is just as much, if not more, to blame for the death of detente.

Ironically, Carter's overzealous efforts to get the SALT II treaty passed by the Senate have backfired. No sooner had SALT II been signed in Vienna last spring than Carter began attempts to appease Congressional hawks who were leery of the treaty. He announced plans to develop the multi-billion dollar MX missile system and pushed for a 3 to 5 percent increase in the military budget over inflation.

A few months later the Carter administration induced the NATO countries to deploy close to 600 advanced nuclear missiles in Western Europe. This action was taken despite Brezhnev's protests and offers to withdraw the newest tactical Soviet missiles trained on Western Europe and to withdraw some Soviet troops and tanks from East Germany.

Carter's moves may have convinced a few senators the SALT II treaty would not mean a decrease in U.S. military strength, but to the Soviets, the moves signalled the end of any pretense of detente between the two superpowers.

Before Americans fall prey to the renewed war fever spreading through the country, they should consider what a military clash over Afghanistan, or Iran for that matter, would mean. Unlike other U.S.-U.S.S.R. struggles flaring around the world, a dispatch of American troops into the area would mean a direct military clash between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. — not some U.S.-supported army fighting Soviet proxies or vice versa.

The U.S. military arsenal is now predominantly nuclear, so if the U.S. went into the area with the intent of defeating the Soviets it would inevitably escalate to nuclear warfare. Needless to say, it's in the economic interest of the war hawks in Washington to prepare for such a war, but one must wonder, is it in their interest to execute it?

Nina Easton is the managing editor of the Daily Californian.

Reprinted with permission from The Daily Californian.

Common Sense and the Common Danger*

Our country is in a period of danger, and the danger is increasing. Unless decisive steps are taken to alert the nation, and to change the course of its policy, our economic and military capacity will become inadequate to assure peace with security.

The principal threat to our nation, to world peace, and to the cause of human freedom is the Soviet drive for dominance based upon an unparalleled military buildup.

The scope and sophistication of the Soviet campaign have been increased in recent years, and its tempo quickened.

For more than a decade, the Soviet Union has been enlarging and improving both its strategic and its conventional military forces far more rapidly than the United States and its allies. Soviet military power and its rate of

* 11 November 1976.

growth cannot be explained or justified by considerations of self-defense. The Soviet Union is consciously seeking what its spokesmen call "visible preponderance" for the Soviet sphere. Such preponderance, they explain, will permit the Soviet Union "to transform the conditions of world politics" and determine the direction of its development.

The process of Soviet expansion and the worldwide deployment of its military power threaten our interest in the political independence of our friends and allies, their and our fair access to raw materials, the freedom of the seas, and in avoiding a preponderance of adversary power. These interests can be threatened not only by direct attack, but also by envelopment and indirect aggression.

To sustain an effective foreign policy, economic strength, military strength, and a commitment to leadership are essential.

If we continue to drift, we shall become second best to the Soviet Union in overall military strength; our alliances will weaken; our promising rapprochement with China could be reversed. Then we could find ourselves isolated in a hostile world, facing the unremitting pressures of Soviet policy backed by an overwhelming preponderance of power. Our national survival itself would be in peril, and we should face, one after another, bitter choices between war and acquiescence under pressure.

Excerpt from "Common Sense and the Common Danger,"
a publication of the Committee on the Present Danger.

'We won't fight for Exxon'

We cannot blame young people for not wanting to be conscripted in the armed forces or even registered for a draft. But we are concerned about the often superficial reasoning of those now joining antidraft movements on campuses in opposition to President Carter's registration plans. Many comments we hear betray a lack of understanding of the issues involved. Even worse, they sometimes seem to convey an attitude of unwillingness to sacrifice – even to the extent of minor inconvenience – for any cause, whatever the stake. An attitude of "myself first and foremost."

When, for instance, a student at Boston University snaps, "I'd fight for America, but I don't want to fight for Exxon," one wonders how deeply he has thought through his response. Safeguarding the Middle East oil supplies is not a favor to the big oil companies. It has to do with the very economic health of the Western world; if that vitality should be threatened because of a cutoff of energy, the West's political systems, too, could be placed in jeopardy. And poorer Americans would be likely to suffer most.

• • •

Or take the comment of still another student as reported by the Boston Globe: "I don't think the Russian invasion of Afghanistan was better or worse than the American invasion of Vietnam. The Russian empire acts much the same as the American empire. I don't think either is worth dying for." If this is typical (and we trust it is not), it shows an appalling ignorance of history and of the diametrically opposed natures of the American and Soviet systems – a failing, we would add, that indicts American institutions of learning.

This is no brief for US involvement in the Vietnam war, or for every policy and strategy pursued by the US Government. These warrant sober public scrutiny, and often strong criticism. But to lump even America's ill-considered efforts to thwart aggression with the Soviet Union's brutal record of subjugation of millions of people in Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, East Germany, Bulgaria – and now Afghanistan – is misguided. Misguided and sad. Such a mentality does not comprehend what distinguishes a democracy from totalitarianism, or what America went through to win and keep its freedoms.

• • •

Or, to cite one last remark, how about "I want America to thrive and prosper, to be strong, but not in a military sense"? We would be the first to agree that military power without political and economic strength and, above all, firm moral purpose would be futile. But can it seriously be thought the United States could do without a defense? Or, more accurately, without a defense adequate to deterring aggression?

What comes through in such comments is a mental laziness that refuses to face up to issues in all their complexity. This is not to say we are convinced a draft is needed, as many (though not the President) say. But the question youth, indeed all Americans, ought to be addressing is whether the all-volunteer army is meeting the nation's defense requirements and, if not, what can be done about it. Conscription should be considered not merely within the context of a war – something few foresee at present; it may be dictated by pragmatic peacetime needs, to assure an adequate reserve force, for instance.

It might also be asked: How "just" and "democratic" is it for an army made up in significant part of poorer and less-educated segments of society to shoulder responsibility for the nation's security? Would it be fairer for all young people to participate? Might not universal participation also assure that the military would *not* go off the deep end with foreign ventures?

In this connection we respect those who refuse service in the military out of genuine conscientious objection, arrived at after searching thought and not as an automatic, unthinking reaction to an unpleasant task. But we share the concerns of many about a present-day tendency to avoid responsibility and self-sacrifice, qualities without which a nation loses its moral and spiritual mettle. The founding fathers enshrined "the pursuit of happiness" as an unalienable right of all men. But they were also mindful of the obligations, to society and to future generations, which must accompany that right. Wrote Thomas Jefferson, "A debt of service is due from every man to his country proportioned to the bounties which nature and fortune have measured to him."

The onus for high-mindedness rests not only with youth, however. Their leaders, too, must embody and convey the idealism and righteous goals which justify self-sacrifice. When President Carter couches his Middle East defense "doctrine" merely in terms of securing the country's oil supplies – and not also of responding to the needs and aspirations of the peoples of the region – he focuses on the material and loses an opportunity to reaffirm the unique contribution America has made and can continue to make in the world. A true battle cry would be to invoke the nation's revolutionary purpose – to help struggling peoples everywhere achieve freedom in the fullest sense of the word. Set in such a context, the call for a strong defense and, if it should come to that, youth's participation in it would no doubt meet with at least more thoughtful discourse.

Reprinted by permission from The Christian Science Monitor
© 1980 The Christian Science Publishing Society
All rights reserved

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

Washington Office

THE DRAFT & CIVIL LIBERTIES

THE DRAFT INFRINGES ON RIGHTS NORMALLY GUARANTEED BY THE CONSTITUTION AND IS NOTHING LESS THAN A FORM OF INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE. The draft destroys the right to decide where you live, to pursue the education of your choice, to select your own type of employment, to negotiate working conditions and to travel freely. The citizen who is drafted loses much of the right of privacy, even more of the right of free speech and expression. Moreover, the system of military law deprives the draftee of the right to a trial before an independent, civilian judge and many other due process rights.

THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM HAS BEEN DRACONIAN IN ITS IMPLEMENTATION. In the past, Congress and the courts denied registrants due process of law. Young men became criminals for disobeying verdicts of local draft boards--verdicts which were issued without the right to counsel and without the benefit of a de novo review in a court of law prior to induction. Equally important, the classification system favored the wealthier, more educated groups and discriminated against the poorer segments of society.

THE ADVENT OF COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY GIVES SELECTIVE SERVICE THE POTENTIAL FOR NEW AND FAR GREATER INTRUSIONS INTO THE LIVES OF AMERICANS. The use of computerized personal data such as drivers' license information, voter registration lists, high school graduation lists, and college matriculation lists for a purpose entirely different from the purpose for which they were compiled poses a massive threat to individual privacy. It exemplifies precisely the kind of manipulation of personal data that people fear most when they contemplate the vulnerability of their privacy in a computer age. If this computer data is coupled with a return to registration and the draft card, Congress will have instituted a universal identifier system. All persons, men and women, will be required to carry this identifier document.

DRAFT REGISTRATION IS NOT JUST THE COLLECTION OF NAMES AND ADDRESSES. Existing Selective Service regulations require registered persons to carry a registration card at all times, and notify their local draft boards when they change their

over ...

600 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E. Washington, D.C. 20003 (202) 544-1681

John H. F. Shattuck, Director • Jerry J. Berman, Karen Christensen, Legislative Counsel
David E. Landau, Staff Counsel • Laura Murphy, Legislative Representative
Norman Dorsen, Chairperson, Board of Directors • Ira Glasser, Executive Director

address, temporarily leave the country, and in some cases change jobs. Furthermore, Section 4(a) of the Military Selective Service Act mandates that "each registrant shall be immediately liable for classification and examination, and shall, as soon as practicable following his registration, be so classified and examined, both physically and mentally..."

THE DRAFT AND ITS SYSTEM IS DIAMETRICALLY OPPOSED TO FREEDOM. Other than imprisonment, there is no institution in our society that results in such a total subjugation of civil liberties as the draft. The founding fathers were sensitive to the evils of conscription and accordingly never expressly authorized it. In 1812, when the nation was invaded and the Capital captured and razed, Congress refused to authorize the draft. Conscription was eventually authorized on a temporary basis during the Civil War, causing widespread rioting because of it. A draft was authorized during World War I, but only because the Army could not accept the overwhelming number of volunteers and needed a mechanism to control the flow of men. It was not until after World War II that the draft was actually authorized in peacetime. For thirty Cold War years, the draft was a habit of mind for this country, winning a lazy acceptance from adults beyond its reach, but creating havoc and hostility from young men whose lives it disrupted and too often took. A few years ago this nation returned to its historical aversion to this onerous institution.

Reprinted with permission by
World Education Center
c/o World Without War Council
1730 Grove St.
Berkeley, CA 94709

6/79

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

theWeekly

June 20 26 1979

Anybody feeling a draft?

by George Weigel

SEVEN YEARS after the last American was conscripted into the armed forces, a spate of restore-the-draft bills has been introduced into the current Congress. At least one, a bill by Congressman P.V. (Sonny) Montgomery (D-Mississipi) to begin draft registration again, stands a good chance of passage. Another, California Republican Paul McCloskey's National Service Act, would move us much closer to the day of mandatory national military or civilian service for all young men and women.

These recent bills have been prompted by the worry that the existing volunteer armed forces are incapable of meeting the country's security needs, particularly in terms of our Reserve forces. Others have criticized the volunteer forces on the grounds that they do not adequately represent American society—that they are attractive only to the unemployed. Conservative guru Milton Friedman, however, recently pointed out in *Newsweek*, than the all-volunteer forces are 2,000 enlistees over their budget-authorized limits, and Secretary of the Army Clifford Alexander, a prominent black attorney in Washington, D.C., has staunchly denied that the all-volunteer Army is a congeries of black mercenaries who couldn't pass a high school equivalency test. Alexander has also noted that the two most traditionally segregated services, the Navy and the Air Force, still have black personnel levels under the black proportion of the total population.

But none of these arguments really gets to the heart of the issue of a draft. There are three crucial issues. The first is a question of *public ethics*. Is it right, in a democracy, to conscript people into the armed forces against their will? Both the New Left and the Old Right say no, the Left because it thinks that national military force is irrelevant in today's world, the Right for libertarian reasons that oppose such a coercive government intervention into citizens' lives. Others who are charged with the military defense of American society are arguing that, whatever the fine points of ideology, the draft is necessary now, particularly in meeting our obligations to our NATO allies. This is the question of *necessity*. Then there is an *equity* question: If you're going to have a draft, how do you do it fairly? McCloskey's bill, for example, tries to preserve some measure of voluntarism by allowing each 18-year-old four options: active duty, reserve duty, civilian service, or being placed in a military lottery for six months (at the end of which, should your number not have come up, you are free of further obligation).

The questions of the ethics, necessity, and equity of conscription all point to a deeper problem: How *do* you protect this society in a world of hostile values and regimes? To date, the reigning assumption has been that you protect society through killing power, "the ability to project national military power in the defense of national interests," as the technicians would say. And harsh as it may sound, one has to admit that there is much to be said for that position. One certainly cannot envy those charged with responsibility for the military defense of this country today. Tocqueville's predictions have come true: The military professions have slipped lower and lower on the job-prestige scales.

The current political mood, particularly in the face of Soviet expansionism, is likely to just accept the killing-power premise, and try to answer the equity question in as politically palatable a way as possible. But what if we made the argument over reinstating the draft the occasion to question the basic premise. What *would* you do if you wanted an alternative to killing power as a means to protect this society? And could you do it in ways that moved others to follow suit?

That argument would begin, I think, by acknowledging that this political community is well worth protecting. The New Left's assumption about America's role as World Ogre is not only a historically weak case, it is an impossible starting point for examining alternatives to the present dominance of military power in the world. But even while acknowledging the basic worth of the United States, a major goal for those seeking an alternative to killing power is the establishment of a world political community with effective legal institutions capable of enforcing agreements, and capable of providing alternative channels for waging conflict. Respect for law and political obligation are essential concerns for those who want to protect *this* political community while working for a wider *polis* capable of providing another means to secure the safety of national communities.

1979 by Susquatch Publishing Company.

85 South Washington Street
Seattle Washington 98104
623-3702

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

That is a point too often missed by young critics of the draft, who disclaim any sense of responsibility for their citizenship. Their attitude reflects the notion that there are rights without responsibilities, a widespread misunderstanding derived from the politics of the 1960s. But if history's alternative to killing power has been law, and if law and effective international institutions are the only likely alternative to armed international anarchy, then building a sense of obligation to political community is fundamental to tempering the dominance of killing power. Opposition to the draft that is based on an antinomian political morality is selfishness, not conviction.

Given these basic assumptions, that America is a political community worth protecting, and that law and world political community are the likeliest alternatives to killing power as the means to protect ourselves, it is clear that the draft provides, at the very best, only a Band-Aid solution to our security problems. Supporters of the draft point to 1940, when in the face of the Nazi and Fascist horrors, a draft bill passed the House by only one vote, and counsel us to be more wary today. I stand on the brink of the 1980s and see what is potentially the most dangerous decade in history, where the volatile combination of massive military power, conventional and nuclear, the anarchy of world politics, and the continuing threat of terrorism suggest that we had better make progress on international legal alternatives to war if we expect to see the 21st century in any kind of safety.

If it is to have an effect on the global problem of an arms race that consumes $400-billion annually, opposition to the draft in America has to be put into a much wider political and ethical context. That context would include an ethic of obligation that would point out responsibilities to both our national political community and to a nascent sense of world political community. The context would also include at least four major political goals. First is the re-establishment of General and Complete Disarmament (GCD), inspected and enforced, as one operationally significant factor in how we make national security decisions. (Although few remember it now, the goal of GCD was official U.S. policy during the Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy administrations.) GCD will not be the only factor, of course. But it ought to be at least one. Cancelling the B-1 bomber, for example, would have had a genuinely disarming impact had it been made in a GCD context, rather than as an exercise in cost-effectiveness.

The second goal is to establish that minimum of international law and governance necessary to provide the alternative to killing power as the means by which nations resolve their conflicts. Third is the development of a sense of world political community sufficient to sustain law and basic human rights by the consent of the governed. And fourth is a commitment to the development of impoverished countries such that they begin to recognize their stake in a new international political order. (That they rarely do now is amply demonstrated by the fact that the highest rate of increased national military spending today is in the Third World.)

Within this wider context, a short-term solution to our draft problems becomes, admittedly, only slightly less murky. The wider context would suggest to concerned and ethical legislators like Paul McCloskey, though, that a constructive World Service alternative might be fitted into a revised National Service scheme. The wider context would also suggest to the libertarian opponents of a draft that the way in which we in America manage our draft could have a positive influence on other countries whose citizens also face conscription in the name of national security.

There will be those who object loudly that all this wider context business does is confuse the issue. I would reply that the past century has clearly demonstrated the impact, for all, that bad ideas have on history. A bad idea got us into Viet Nam. More bad ideas about what that meant have collapsed any working consensus on America's right role in world affairs. A narrow idea of arms control (plus a lack of political imagination, Soviet intransigence, and a dangerously polarized citizenry) has produced a SALT-2 agreement that, whatever its merits, is inadequate to the problem in just about anyone's view of things. Whatever else can be said about the wider context I have sketched here, it cannot be credibly argued that the larger arena of ideas in which the draft question gets resolved is not crucially important.

If the draft debate becomes the occasion in which Americans get clear again on the necessity (and limits) of political obligation, and the occasion to at least raise up the question of the basic premise of our—and everyone else's—national security policy, then its resolution may actually bring us an inch along the road to something better. If it does not get at these deeper questions then it can only make the future even more grim.

George Weigel is a Roman Catholic theologian and scholar-in-residence at the World Without War Council of Greater Seattle.

TYPES OF RESPONSES TO MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

Choices Made According to Conscience

"Draft resisters" was a term used in the late Vietnam years to lump together all men who, for a variety of reasons, sought to exempt themselves and/or others from military conscription in the United States. This generalization of individual motives may be useful for political purposes (i.e., as it was used during the Vietnam years to organize broad-based opposition to American military policy). It is not, however, of much use to those seeking to understand the choices young men must make when confronted with military conscription. It confuses legal and illegal positions. It blurs important differences among those opposed to military conscription and war.

An individual's response to compulsory military service and to the demand of society that he serve in the armed forces must be among the most significant decisions of his life. It may mean death or injury on the battlefield; it may mean jail or emigration. Given these possible personal consequences and equally grave consequences for the society, it is a decision that should be made soberly and with adequate background information.

The classifications listed below characterize the major responses to the draft. From the standpoint of moral choice and religious values, variations within the categories may be more significant than differences between the categories. It is important, therefore, to avoid overly simple group classifications of very complex individual responses. With this caution, then, here are six categories of conscientious choice in regard to compulsory military service.

1. Acceptance of the military. While most men accept the draft unthinkingly, some seriously deliberate the problems of war and violence and search out their beliefs and responsibilities. They then decide that they must participate in the draft or a war. These men would not declare that war is right and good. But they may believe that the consequences of not going to war may be more evil than war itself. They may feel that while they want to rid the world of war in the long run, war or the preparation for war is the most practical response to an immediate threat. They may believe that a strong military is the best insurance against war. During World War II, many men felt that participation was the only moral act open to men of conscience. For such men, cooperation with the war effort was a principled conscientious act.

2. Legally recognized conscientious objection. Selective Service Law exempts from combat training and service those who are "conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form." Historically, this exemption first came about because of the efforts of the "peace churches," the Quakers, Mennonites and Brethren. It was regarded as a freedom of religion issue -- a conflict between the beliefs of a religious community and the needs of the political community. Our country gave priority to religious belief.

Later, conscientious objection was granted to persons from religious groups which did not regard a pacifist commitment as a central part of their tradition. If an individual could demonstrate to the satisfaction of the government that his "religious training and belief" prevented him from participating in war, he was recognized as a C.O. (See Conscientious Objector in the Glossary.)

Toward the end of the Vietnam era, the Supreme Court ruled that a man need not belong to an established religion in order to be eligible for a C.O. exemption. Ethical and moral beliefs could qualify a man if those beliefs occupied in his life " a place parallel to that filled by the orthodox belief in God in a traditionally religious person". (See Seeger Decision and Welsh Decision in the Glossary.)

There are two selective service classifications for the C.O.: I-O and I-A-O. Both require proof that a man is profoundly opposed to participation in any war. The I-O is opposed to participation in all war and to service in the military. The I-A-O is willing to serve as a non-combatant in the military. Both classifications require that individuals register. If conscription is re-instituted, the I-O will be drafted to alternative service in the national interest, for example, a hospital. C.O.s thus fulfill their responsibilities to the political community by working as civilians in approved jobs. In the past, two years of alternative service with a non-profit or government agency was required. The I-A-O will be drafted and serve as a non-combatant in one of the armed services. He will not be required to carry a weapon and will probably be assigned to the medical corps.

There are many rationales for conscientious objection to war. Even within one tradition, Christian pacifism, we find five different rationales explaining a Christian refusal to enter the armed forces and to participate in war. For example, in Roman times, the Christian opposed military service because it was idolatrous; a Roman soldier was expected to worship the emperor's idol. In modern times, Christian pacifists have based their refusal on the Gospel command of love. Pacifists differ not only in their explanation of why they refuse to bear arms in war but also in the action they are expected to take. Some, e.g. the Mennonites, believe that the best way to overcome evil is not to resist it. Others, e.g. those in the Gandhian tradition, defend and advance values using non-violent rather than violent means.

A C.O. may refuse to engage in <u>any</u> violence or he may object <u>only</u> to the mass organized violence of war. He may act out of a commitment to the individual human being in the enemy camp or from a profound belief that opposition to war is the only way to preserve the human race. Whatever the rationale, the term C.O. is usually reserved for those who cannot in conscience lend themselves to the mass indiscriminate violence of war.

A pragmatic test of whether a person is or is not a C.O. is his willingness to choose jail rather than participate in killing other people in war. Most C.O.s feel an obligation to their country but cannot in good conscience fulfill it by entering the armed forces. They therefore seek some alternative way to meet the obligations of citizenship.

3. Unrecognized conscientious objection. In the past, there have been many instances when a man was denied C.O. classification by his draft board. This may have occured because of the man's inability to clearly explain his position and defend it. His draft board may also have used a narrow or even legally erroneous criteria in making its judgment.

But the determination of whether an individual is a C.O. is made first and foremost by the man himself. If he opposes participation in war because he believes it would be morally wrong to participate, if he accepts a responsible role in the community because he cares about it and is willing to serve it in other ways, he is a C.O. The conferral of C.O. status by the Selective Service System (SSS) simply means that in the government's judgment, the individual has fulfilled the legal requirements of the law.

Some men may be conscientiously opposed, not to all war, but to participation in a particular war. Such selective C.O.s have not been recognized by the SSS. The law requires opposition to all war as a condition for receiving C.O. exemption.

A C.O. whose claims are not recognized by the SSS must face a difficult choice: submit to induction and violate his conscience or refuse induction and be subject to legal penalties. He may wish to take his case to the courts. He can do so only by violating the law and standing trial. Whether the man is recognized by the government or not, if he is open in his refusal to be drafted, if he accepts the penalty of the law, most people would regard him as a conscientious objector.

4. Noncooperation or Resistance. Noncooperators or resisters object to compulsory military service. Some object to war; others do not. They refuse to register or have any part in a military system. If they become resisters after registration, they refuse to apply for a C.O. exemption or do alternative service if classified as a C.O. Previously, when classifications were made on the basis of information provided at the time of registration, some noncooperators refused to provide that information. In some cases they returned their draft cards;in others, they burned them. Resisters do not want to take advantage of even those aspects of the Selective Service Law that might exempt them, e.g. an exemption for a minister of religion.

There are many reasons given for resistance and a number of ways resisters act out their beliefs. A Christian Pacifist may adopt this position for his reasons, an anarchist for his, a member of the Revolutionary Communist Party for his. As in all other categories, there are radical differences of belief within this category. Among resisters there are those who oppose war and those who don't; those who oppose the draft law but accept the authority of the legal and political system and those who oppose both; those who act personally and those who seek, violently or non-violently, to impose their beliefs on others; those who are honest in their relation to government authorities and those who regard the government as their enemy and feel no obligation to tell the truth.

Resistance demonstrates that opposition to the draft can be a broader issue than opposition to war. Many conservatives and liberals alike may oppose the draft mainly as a violation of personal freedom. Opposition to the draft from the Libertarian Party and from the American Civil Liberties Union illustrate this position.

Many resisters believe that participation in the U.S. Armed Forces is wrong and that cooperation would violate their integrity. Those who hold this position sincerely believe that the nation would benefit from the abolition of conscription, that every increase in individual freedom serves the society. Many have been willing to accept prison to testify to their beliefs.

There is another aspect of "resistance" that needs to be considered. For some, resistance is primarily a political strategy. These people seek to prevent the operation of the law (e.g. they may "flood the post office" so that men can't get in to register). Resisters, in this case, are seeking to replace the normal political process with direct action to impose their political will.

Because there are different kinds of resisters, it is important to make distinctions like conscientious resister, revolutionary resister, libertarian resister, etc., in order to understand the movitation behind the act of resistance.

5. Emigration. Leaving the country is one option for a person who believes that participation in a war is wrong. Historically, emigration to escape tyranny and/or military service has been a respected act. Many Russian immigrants came to the U.S. to get away from the Tsarist draft. Others fled Europe after the revolutions of 1848 failed.

During the Vietnam years, a number of American men left the country. Some claimed that they were making moral statements about war or about the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Others were simply asserting their right to leave the country to live where they wanted to live. Men of draft age who leave the country still have an obligation to perform military service. If they do not keep their draft boards informed of their whereabouts and if they do not respond to induction calls, they are subject to arrest and prosecution if they ever return, unless an amnesty act is passed exempting them from such prosecution.

Some, opposed to war, believe that a democratic political process is viable in this country and regard emigration as an abandonment of responsiblity to stay and work for changes in foreign policy or draft laws. Some emigres believe their act is a political act, one which sends an important message to their former countrymen. Others make no claim to serving any other value but their own personal well-being. Still others see emigration as a way to avoid responsibility for killing other human beings. The choice the conscientious emigre makes is between breaking with his political community or (a) staying a part of it and accepting the legal penalties of following his conscience, or (b) submitting to induction and, perhaps, participation in war.

6. Seeking Deferments. In the past, many men have sought to deal with problems of conscience and the draft by qualifying for a deferred classification. They may have sought a student deferment or chosen a deferred occupation simply because such classification enabled them to avoid military service. This was a legal course of action which some men chose conscientiously, preferring to

distort the normal course of their lives, if by doing so they could avoid killing other human beings. Some simply sought to protect their own lives, whatever the consequences for the country. A conscientious person is truthful and seeks a deferment honestly. He does not, for example, fake a physical or mental disability. A C.O., like any other man, may seek to obtain a deferment, but if he fails to receive the deferment or C.O. status, he will have to make a difficult choice. Either he will go into the army or he will obey his conscience and go to jail. The person who merely seeks to avoid the draft will, if all else fails, go into the army.

Problems of conscience within the military. While some men enter the military service because of a sense of obligation, many do so without thinking at all about their principles or the nature of war. They accept the draft because they believe they have no choice, or because everyone is expected to and does, or because they want to get away from home, or to get technical training, or for many other reasons. Many problems arise for a man who realizes his conscientious objection to war after he has joined the armed forces. Receiving legal recognition as a C.O. is particularly difficult within the system of military law; career officers feel that a man should have dealt with his conscience before submitting to induction, that once he has accepted military service, he is committed to obey orders. Nevertheless, men in the military have claimed and been recognized as conscientious objectors, long and arduous as the process may be.

IMPORTANT: See overside ...

FOR THE YOUNG PERSON

considering his response to military conscription ...

The categories of response to military conscription briefly described above may aid you in making your own choice. Because the issues are complex and the consequences serious, you will want to give thoughtful consideration to what you will do. Here are some of the most important questions you may want to consider as you decide:

1. Is participation in war or preparation for war wrong? Is it absolutely wrong or perhaps wrong, but not so much as other evils? Are there acts of war which you could not in conscience perform?

2. Do you believe you should cooperate with the laws made to provide for the security of the political community that nurtured you? Do you assert a personal responsibility for your acts that take priority over the demands of society? Have you thought about this country, the United States of America: Do you have a responsibility to defend it? Do you have a responsibility to other human beings who live in other political communities?

3. Are there beliefs, values, responsibilities for which you would sacrifice your own material well-being? What do they have to do with war? with citizenship?

4. Were you raised in a religious tradition? Do you know what that tradition teaches about these choices?

5. How important is personal integrity to you? Does it require honesty in dealing with others? with government? Is it important to you to make the right decision, not just the easy one?

If you want help in thinking through your answers or in encountering a number of answers others have given, call

The World Education Center
Conscience & War Program

or

The World Without War Council

1730 Grove Street
Berkeley CA 94709

415/845-1992

FOR: Those considering applying for conscientious objector status with the Selective Service System

RE: Your C.O. file

It is important for anyone considering becoming a conscientious objector as an alternative to military service in case of conscription to begin now to document his claim. Beginning a CO file now can also help you in deepening and clarifying the basis of your stand as a conscientious objector to war.

What is a CO file? It is a record of your beliefs that are relevant to your position on questions of war and peace and of the actions that demonstrate those beliefs. Its purpose is to offer evidence of your stand as a CO. If you are asked to appear before a draft board, you will then have a way of proving that your decision to become a CO is sincere and well thought through.

What goes into a CO file? A CO file will be most effective if it contains substantive materials that show your beliefs about war and peace. For this reason, essays on the subject (written for school, student newspapers, etc., or on your own) are quite useful. Also, if you write letters to congressmen or the President concerning your views on the draft or American foreign policy, it would be good to keep a copy of them in your file. If you write letters to the editors of newspapers, keep a copy of the original and, if it is printed, a copy of the printed version. Remember, there is a difference between a disagreement on military or security policy and conscientious objection to war. Think about how you formed your ideas and keep a record of that. Keep a philosophical journal. Acts you have performed, discussions with parents or teachers, the influences that led you to a CO position, reading you've done -- all are grist for a good CO file.

Who keeps the CO file? You should maintain your own file. However, it might be useful also to take advantage of a service some religious and pacifist organizations offer. They have established a list of men who register with them as CO's. They can then testify to this fact in later years. Most national religious organizations maintain such lists. The addresses of several national organizations can be found on the back of this sheet. You should write them a letter asking them to list you as a CO. Briefly tell them why. Keep a copy of the letter in your own file.

Here in Northern California, the World Without War Council maintains such a list and can tell you of other local agencies.

Books and kits of materials, a chance to talk through the problems involved in becoming a conscientious objector, are all available at:

World Without War Council
1730 Grove Street
Berkeley CA 94709 415/845-1992

over ...

The following national organizations are among those who are prepared to keep individuals' names on file as having registered with them as CO's.

National Interreligious Service
Board for Conscientious Objectors (NISBCO)
550 Washington Building
15th and New York Avenue, NW
Washington D C 20005
(202) 393-4868

Central Committee for Conscientious
Objectors (CCCO)
P. O. Box 15796
Philadelphia PA 19103
(215) 545-4626

National Council of Churches
475 Riverside Drive
New York N Y 10027
(212) 870-3114

[Information on Episcopal, Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, and United Church of Christ registrars of CO's, as well as of Catholic and Jewish registrars, available on request.]

A number of secular agencies also maintain lists.

Full information on these and, more importantly, on local registrars, available from:

World Without War Council
Citizen Responsibility, Conscience
and War Program
1730 Grove Street
Berkeley CA 94709

8.15.80

DECISIONS, DECISIONS, DECISIONS

Introductory note: What is presently required by law (summer 1980) is that young men register with the Selective Service System. There is no draft. But the re-instatement of draft registration does pose the question: what would I do if I received a draft notice? Going through the decision-making process described below is not an empty task. It provides an opportunity to examine questions of war and peace and the individual's conscientious response. Such reflection is a useful process for dealing with the moral problems that war and international conflict pose -- a task that thoughtful people take seriously. But it should not be forgotten, given the volatile situation in our world, that a draft could be authorized and implemented within a relatively short period of time.

So for now, assume that Congress has passed draft legislation and that there is a possibility you might be called.

..ooOoo..

Making a decision on how you will respond to the draft may be the first major decision in your life -- and one for which you, and you alone, are responsible. You may be a little scared and confused. Keep in mind that if you seriously try to make a thoughtful decision, you are doing the right thing. Even if in later years you change your mind, you will know that given your age, knowledge and resources, you made the best decision you could. This is no small accomplishment!

We suggest that you make sure that you have some specific information and that you review what you know about some other areas related to the war/peace field. It might be a good idea to write out questions that you want to think more about, or for which you want to do some research. Then we suggest a way to compare some of the ways in which people have responded to a military draft. We then offer some thougnts on feelings and judgments.

A word of advice: Walk, don't run through a decision-making process. Give yourself time -- pause and reflect. Take a few side paths if they interest you. Questions of conscience and war are complex and require time, patience and perseverance.

over ...

Specific information you should have

- Selective Service regulations regarding registration and the draft.
- How the Selective Service System operates and what the various classifications regarding availability for service are.
- Penalties for non-compliance with the law.
- Teachings about war and peace found in your religious and moral tradition.

Some general understandings that are helpful

- Some knowledge about world events. Do you keep up by reading a newspaper or news magazine?
- Think back about what you learned about war and peace in history.
- Some idea of what modern warfare means.
- Ways in which members of your church (religious tradition) have responded to problems of war and efforts for peace.

In addition, you may want to find out how each of the following persons would explain their position: the person who accpts the just war theory; the individual who believes that a crusade is warranted; and the conscientious objector.*

Questions for further thought

In the self-survey, "Military Service and the Draft: What Do You Think?" (found in this packet), Section V directed you to list further questions you wanted to explore. You may want to list them now if you have not yet found satisfactory answers to them. Since you responded to the survey, other questions may have occurred to you. Some examples of the kinds of questions you may have are:

- As a citizen of the United States, what responsibilities do I have?
- Are there some things worse than war? Are there times when I would participate in war? Times when I would not?
- What images does war bring to mind?

* See Glossary for specific definitions of just war theory, crusade and conscientious objector (CO).

Comparing possible choices and consequences

Question nine of the self-survey ("Military Service and the Draft: What Do You Think?") lists eight different ways individuals have responded to a military draft. Choose three or four of the options that most interest you and compare reasons, values and choices. For each of the options, ask these questions:

1. What are the reasons someone may have for making this particular choice? Give as many as you can.
2. What do you think is important to someone who takes this option?
3. How might an individual's life be affected by making this choice?
4. How might other people's lives be affected?

So far, you have gone through a good deal of information and have examined a number of options. Are there one or two choices that seem to make the most sense to you? If so, it might be helpful to review the pro's and con's for these in terms of what is important to you.

Reflect on your feelings

Sometimes what we judge we ought to do conflicts with what we feel we ought to do. Sometimes there is no disagreement. Sometimes we make decisions that those who are close to us (family, friends) respect. At other times, they may let us know that they think our decisions are foolish, selfish or unrealistic. We need to decide to what extent we will incorporate others' reactions into our decision.

If you feel uneasy about following through on the option that seems to make most sense to you, try to locate the reason for your uneasiness. Is it because you are worried or unsure of how some special people might react to your decision? Is it because you are afraid that if you follow through on your choice, you will come to some harm? Is it because not all of your questions have been answered? Is it because you've never had to make a choice like this before?

over ...

A word about self-interest and another about idealism

- What place does self-interest have in a serious and thoughtful decision?

Self-interest has a negative connotation when the person considers only himself and takes little account of how others might be affected, or when it causes him to evade his responsibilities. The individual who says "I am concerned about how this choice may affect my life: I am the one who must live with my decision" is grounding his thinking in reality. Selflessness is not always possible; neither is it always desireable.

- What place does idealism have in a serious and thoughtful decision?

It would be excluding spiritual and moral principles if people only look to the "practical" and the "useful" in making life's decisions. Idealism helps individuals look beyond themselves to larger concerns and to seek higher goals. However, the kind of idealism that may be harmful is that which closes people's eyes to the here and now. This can lead to discouragement (who can reach such lofty goals?) or to making decisions that do not take into account the real world. A person cannot lose sight of the reality of the situation, but neither should ideals be left out of the decision-making process.

* * * * * * * * *

A FINAL NOTE AND A CHALLENGE

If you have gone through most of the packet, you have done a great deal of thinking and reflecting on the problems of conscience, war and peace. The emphasis has been on the first two, conscience and war. It is hoped that these materials may offer you a challenge you will accept. If you accept the challenge, you will begin to think about, and then put on your agenda, finding responses to these two questions:

> How can the United States become a leader in moving toward a world in which war is no longer an accepted way of settling disputes between nations and peoples?
>
> How can I contribute to building a world without war?

# # #

Prepared for the Conscience and War Education Program, World Education Center, c/o World Without War Council, 1730 Grove Street, Berkeley CA 94709.

CONSCIENCE AND WAR -- A GLOSSARY

ALL VOLUNTEER FORCE -- Description of our present (summer 1980) armed forces which are made up entirely of those who enlist. After World War II, the draft was allowed to lapse (1947) but was re-instated in 1948 and lasted until 1973. Although the number of young men actually drafted during those years varied according to military needs, all young men between the ages of 18 and 26 were required to register. In 1973, conscription once again lapsed, although Selective Service Law remained in place. At that point and still today, all members of our armed services voluntarily enlist, hence "all volunteer force."

ALTERNATIVE SERVICE -- Service with civilian agencies, required of conscientious objectors who have a 1-O classification (those available for civilian service only). Some CO's are willing to do non-combatant service within the armed forces. These are classified 1-A-O.

CLASSIFICATIONS -- An ordered list of categories establishing registrants' availability for service. Not a part of proposed (June 1980) draft registration legislation. Some examples of categories previously used: 1-A, available for military duty; 4-D, exemption for ministers; and 4-F, not qualified for service. By law, the draft board cannot classify an individual for military duty if they qualify for a deferred or an exempt classification.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR (CO) -- One who by reason of religious and/or ethical belief, opposes war.* Selective Service Law exempts from combat training and service those who oppose all war, but requires that the individual be assigned a non-combatant duty within the service or work of national importance under civilian direction. SSL makes no provision for those who object to a particular war but not all war, nor for those who object to compulsory service.

* "Religious training and belief," languaged used in SSL, has been interpreted in two U.S. Supreme Court decisions. See Seeger and Welsh, below.

CONSCRIPTION — As used in this kit, induction of individuals for compulsory military service.

DUE PROCESS — Established legal procedures designed to protect the rights of individuals coming before a governmental administrative or judicial agency.

DEFERMENT -- Postponement of induction. Before a draft board classifies an individual as available for service, they must be satisfied that he does not fit into a deferment category.

EXEMPTION -- Release from obligation to serve in the military. For example, 4-D and 4-G classifications. The former excuses ministers of religions, and the latter "sole surviving sons." As in the case of deferments, the draft board must make sure that an individual is not eligible for exemption before classifying him as available for duty. We do not know at this time what classification categories will be exempt in any future draft.

over ...

INDUCTION -- The process whereby an individual reports to a specific place and is legally enrolled in one of the armed services.

JUST WAR THEORY -- Ideas in the Christian tradition which establish the standards by which one may determine whether the violence of war is justified.

LOTTERY -- Random selection system for determining which men of a given age group will be required to fulfill a service obligation.

NATIONAL SERVICE -- A variety of proposals to broaden the concept of service to the nation to needs other than military. Some believe that these programs should be compulsory, others voluntary.

NON-VIOLENCE -- Beliefs which reject the use of violence. In many cases, involving philosophies that seek to develop non-violent forms of conflict prosecution or resolution. Belief in non-violence may be principled or tactical, may involve active forms of resistance or may counsel non-resistance. These beliefs have very different rationales and take different forms. For example, non-violence is found in such diverse philosophies as Hinduism, Christianity, anarchism and the Gandhian tradition.

PACIFIST -- Someone opposed to war. More specifically, someone who refuses to participate in war. The term covers a wide variety of beliefs and behavior. Pacifists differ in their reasons for refusing, the nature of the refusal to participate, and their sense of a citizen's responsibilities. Usually, the term is reserved for a person who is normally a law-abiding member of the political community but who, because of fundamental beliefs, says "no" when it comes to participating in war -- any war.

REGISTRATION -- The first step required for military conscription. When a young man reaches a certain age, determined by law, he is obligated to provide the government with certain personal information deemed necessary by the Selective Service -- name, address, birthdate, social security number (optional). According to present regulations, individuals will not fill out classification forms when they register (as was done in the past). It is expected that requests for exemptions or deferments will be made after the registrant receives his draft notice (<u>if</u> there should be a draft and <u>if</u> the individual's name is one of those drawn in the lottery). Non-registration is a violation of the law and is punishable by a prison term and a fine.

RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS (ROTC) -- A college program whereby the individual receives some military training. On completion of the program, he will be eligible for a commission as an officer in one of the armed services. Some financial assistance with college costs is usually involved.

SEEGER DECISION -- The 1965 Supreme Court ruling that exemptions from combat training and service could not be limited to persons holding religious beliefs in the conventional sense -- that is, centering on belief in a Supreme Being. The Court ruled that CO status should be given to a person opposed to all war because of a profound "belief that is sincere and meaningful" and which "occupies a place in the life of its possessor parallel to that filled by the orthodox belief in God of one who clearly qualifies for the exemption."

SELECTIVE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR -- One who by reason of religious and/or ethical belief opposes participation in a particular war, but not all war. Selective Service Law does not recognize the selective conscientious objector.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM -- The governmental agency responsible for administering the rules and regulations whereby individuals are classified, or exempted, for military service.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING -- The concept that all eligible men, when reaching a certain age, be obligated to undergo a period of military training and service.

WAR -- A form of conflict resolution between political communities which is characterized by extensive military operations, widespread destruction and, most often, indiscriminate killing. It requires that the populations and resources of the commities be organized to overcome, or at a minimum resist, the enemy. There is no international law against war itself for there is no recognized authority to either make such a law or enforce it.

WELSH DECISION -- The 1970 Supreme Court ruling that a CO exemption must be given to an individual who "deeply and sincerely holds beliefs which are purely ethical or moral in source and content but which nevertheless impose upon him a duty of conscience to refrain from participation in any war at any time ..." The Court held that "those beliefs certainly occupy in the life of that individual 'a place parallel to that filled by ... God' in traditionally religious persons."

prepared by the World Education Center
c/o World Without War Council
1730 Grove Street
Berkeley CA 94709

CONSCIENCE AND WAR

... BIBLIOGRAPHY ...

The following, while perhaps appearing extensive, is only a sampling of the voluminous literature on the subject of conscience and war. Each entry is classified for convenience under its primary focus, but many also deal with other aspects of the subject.

— THE INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIETY —

THE LAST DAYS OF SOCRATES, Plato (Penguin, 1954) A collection of Plato's dialogues dealing with Socrates' arrest, trial and death. Socrates, accused of heresy, allows himself to be poisoned by the court rather than discontinue his advocacy of reason over religion. A classic example of civil disobedience which affirms truth, conscience and law.

OBLIGATION AND DISSENT: AN INTRODUCTION TO POLITICS, Donald Hansen, Robert Fowler (ed) (Little, Brown, 1971) An excellent collection of essays which juxtapose contrasting views of such problems as the rights to civil disobedience, selective conscientious objection to war, and revolution. A useful introduction to a number of central questions.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE: THEORY AND PRACTICE, Hugo A. Bedau (ed) (Pegasus, 1969) An excellent anthology presenting various points of view on civil disobedience. It is divided into three main sections: against racism, against war, and interpretations and justifications. Selections included are by Thoreau, Richard Wasserstrom, John Rawls, A.J. Muste, Martin Luther King, Jr., and others.

OBLIGATION AND THE BODY POLITIC, Joseph Tussman (Oxford, 1960) A forceful statement of a social obligation to obey the law based on the doctrine of tacit consent. The author maintains that an individual who accepts the benefits of a society incurs an obligation to uphold its laws.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE: CONSCIENCE, TACTICS AND THE LAW, Carl Cohen (Columbia, 1971) A well-rounded book which distinguishes different forms of civil disobedience and examines how and when they might be justified. The author claims that civil disobedience does not weaken the fabric of a well-ordered society, but is critical of the weaker arguments presented in defense of CD.

OF HOLY DISOBEDIENCE, A. J. Muste (Pendle Hill, 1952) Muste, an activist and leader in American pacifist thought, argues in this essay that non-cooperation with the Selective Service System (i.e., refusal to register for the draft) is morally superior to the C.O. position.

— RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHICAL VIEWPOINTS —

PHILOSOPHERS OF PEACE AND WAR: KANT, CLAUSEWITZ, MARX AND ENGELS, TOLSTOY, W. B. Gallie (Cambridge Univ Press, 1978) Consisting of public lectures delivered at Queens University, Belfast, this book outlines the views of five philosophers of war and peace. Kant's call for "Perpetual Peace" based on world law, Clausewitz' "total war," Marx and Engels' revolutionary war for historical change, and Tolstoy's anarchist-pacifist beliefs are studied in depth. An excellent examination of the roots of many currently expressed ideas about peace and war.

THE MORAL DILEMMA OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS, William Clacy (ed) (Council on Religion and International Affairs, 1961) An anthology of works bringing together political scientists, military strategists, journalists and theologians. An excellent introduction to the subject.

MODERN WAR AND THE PURSUIT OF PEACE, Theodore Weber (CRIA, 1968) A thorough examination of the just war theory and an evaluation of its application to modern warfare.

CHRISTIAN ATTITUDES TOWARD WAR AND PEACE, Roland Bainton (Abingdon Press, 1960) This historical survey and critical appraisal covers the range of ethical perspectives found in the Christian heritage and explores the historical context in which each emerged. An excellent introduction.

WAR AND CONSCIENCE IN AMERICA, Edward Long, Jr. (Westminster, 1968) A lucid explication of the great variety of attitudes toward war voiced during the Vietnam era, many of which remain current today. The author gives serious consideration to both conscientious participation in war and conscientious objection to war.

WAR AND PEACE IN THE WORLD'S RELIGIONS, John Ferguson (Oxford, 1978) A brief and clear survey of the teachings on war and peace found in tribal religions, Zoroastrianism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Sikhism, Baha'i and the religions of the Far East. A good introduction to a wide spectrum of beliefs.

WAR AND MORAL RESPONSIBILITY, R. B. Brandt et al (Princeton, 1974) An anthology which surveys the moral and ethical issues involved in war: Is it ever justified? Can it be conducted justly? Who decides? Contributors include Richard Wasserstrom, Thomas Nagel and Michael Walzer.

(Religious and Philosophical Viewpoints, continued)

THEIR MORALS AND OURS: MARXIST VS. LIBERAL VIEWS ON MORALITY, Leon Trotsky et al (Path Press, 1974) The Marxist argument for the morality of revolutionary violence to gain social objectives is presented, along with responses by John Dewey and George Novak. A classic presentation of the belief that "the ends justify the means."

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AND CHRISTIAN ETHICS, John Bennett and Harvey Seifert (Westminster, 1977) Explores the morality of deterrence, war, economic systems and change; dismisses the crusade ethics as "anachronistic"; examines areas of cooperation between "just war" and "pacifict" ethicists.

THE LIMITS OF NUCLEAR WAR: THINKING ABOUT THE DO-ABLE AND THE UN-DO-ABLE, Paul Ramsey (CRIA, 1963) An exploration of the conditions and methods under which a nuclear war might be justified. An outline of criteria for determining a "just nuclear war" is suggested.

THE ILIAD, OR THE POEM OF FORCE, Simone Weil (Pendle Hill, 1956) An impressive interpretation of the Homeric epic as teaching the effects of violence on those who use it as well as those who suffer under it.

NEW CALL TO PEACEMAKING: A CHALLENGE TO ALL FRIENDS, Norval Hadley (ed) (Faith and Life, 1976) Seven authors seek to re-establish and clarify the Quakers' historic commitment to non-violence. They also suggest that this commitment be extended toward actively working to build the conditions for peace in world politics.

WORDS OF CONSCIENCE, Shawn Perry (NISBCO, 1980) A collection of statements from various religious bodies dealing with the question of conscientious objection to war.

JEWISH VALUES AND SOCIAL CRISIS: A CASEBOOK FOR SOCIAL ACTION, Albert Vorspan (Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1973) A helpful attempt to relate the teachings of Judaism to contemporary problems. Includes sections on "War, Peace and Conscience"; "Civil Disobedience"; and "Israel and Zionism."

— JUSTIFICATIONS OF WAR AND VIOLENCE —

ON AGGRESSION, Konrad Lorenz (Bantam, 1970) Lorenz argues that there is a "fighting instinct in beast and man which is directed against members of the same species."

THE NATURE OF HUMAN AGGRESSION, Ashley Montagu (Oxford, 1976) Montagu takes issue with the innate aggressionists, Lorenz, Ardrey, Tibergen and Morris. He maintains that humans are capable of all kinds of behavior, and that behavior is determined by the interaction of experience and genetic constitution.

(Justifications of War and Violence, continued)

REFLECTIONS ON VIOLENCE, Georges Sorel (MacMillan, 1967) Written in 1906, this is a classic study of the methods of social revolution. Covering class war, prejudices against violence, general strikes, the ethics of violence and other topics, this book clearly expresses Sorel's belief that only the clearest and most brutal expression of class war can bring about lasting social change. An influential source for much of today's rationale for revolutionary violence.

THE WRETCHED OF THE EARTH, Frantz Fanon (Grove Press, 1963) Fanon, a psychoanalyst and leading spokesman of the Algerian revolution, argues that violence in the ex-colonial countries is necessary to the achievement of true dignity and selfhood. He equates dignity with power over others, and denounces the cities of the world as strongholds of neo-colonialism. Fanon sets no limits to his justification of violence, making his argument presumably valid against anyone in power.

MORAL MAN AND IMMORAL SOCIETY, Reinhold Niebuhr (Scribners, 1960) One of Niebuhr's basic works which set the categories in which the issue of the morality of war is still being argued. Niebuhr justifies the use of violent means in the conduct of international affairs by holding that societies are special entities to which the rules of individual morality cannot apply.

— PACIFISM AND NON-VIOLENCE —

CHRISTIAN PACIFISM IN HISTORY, Geoffrey Nuttall (WWWC, 1971) Traces five lines of Christian thought justifying a refusal to participate in war.

PEACE AND NON-VIOLENCE: BASIC WRITINGS, Edward Guinan (ed) (Paulist Press, 1973) An anthology of writings from different traditions on non-violence.

ALL MEN ARE BROTHERS, M. K. Gandhi (Continuum, 1980) An anthology of Gandhi's writings on war, international peace, poverty, disarmament and related subjects. Compiled by UNESCO.

NEITHER VICTIMS NOR EXECUTIONERS, Albert Camus (Continuum, 1980) Camus argues that before we can make other moral decisions, we must first decide whether or not we are willing to be murderers. Robert Pickus' introduction connects this fundamental statement with the confusions of the American anti-war movement.

CONQUEST OF VIOLENCE, Joan Bondurant (University of California Press, 1965) The best introduction to Gandhian pacifism, using concrete examples from Gandhi's struggles for Indian independence. Criticizes the frequent identification of power with military force and cites Gandhi's success in transforming his opponents.

(Pacifism and Non-Violence, continued)

FOR PEACE AND JUSTICE: PACIFISM IN AMERICA, 1914 - 1941, Charles Chatfield (University of Tennessee Press, 1971) An historical look at the ideas, people and events that shaped the American peace movement from World War I to the beginnings of World War II. Covered are the types of responses to war as well as the effects and consequences of those responses.

NON-VIOLENCE IN AMERICA: A DOCUMENTARY HISTORY, Staughton Lynd (Bobbs-Merrill, 1966) An anthology of writings, covering selections from the early settlers to contemporary theologians, this book attempts to present a history of the idea of non-violence in America. Quaker, anarchist, C.O., trade unionist, direct action and non-violent revolution statements are included.

- ALTERNATIVES TO WAR -

TOWARD A DEPENDABLE PEACE: A PROPOSAL FOR AN APPROPRIATE SECURITY SYSTEM, Robert C. Johansen (Institute for World Order, 1978) Johansen argues that the present security system based on military force leads to increasing insecurity through the proliferation of nuclear and conventional arms, the depletion of natural resources used in arms production, and the growing destructiveness of new weapons being developed. He proposes an alternative to the arms race based on internationally monitored national arms reduction initiatives. This, he maintains, would put international pressure on other nations to respond in kind. Distinguishes between arms control and disarmament, seeing the former as merely stabilizing an arms race while the latter actually reduces and eliminates arms.

NON-VIOLENT ACTION AND SOCIAL CHANGE, Severyn Bruyn and Paula Rayman (ed) (Irvington, 1979) A collection of essays which describe and explain the process of non-violent action. Encompassing case studies as well as theory, the book presents a broad view of the subject. Selections included are by Paul Wehr, David Toscano, Gene Sharp and others.

WAR WITHOUT WEAPONS: NON-VIOLENCE IN NATIONAL DEFENSE, Anders Boserup and Andrew Mack (Schocken, 1975) A very thorough discussion and analysis of the possibilities of resistance to attack or invasion by unified action without the normal weapons of war. There are many references to the forms of resistance practiced by the European nations during World War II, and to other recent conflict situations.

STABLE PEACE, Kenneth E. Boulding (University of Texas Press, 1978) Boulding's attempt to answer the question, "If we had a policy for peace, what would it look like?" He explains that a policy for peace aims to speed up the historically slow transition from a state of continual war and turmoil to one of stable peace.

(Alternatives to War, continued)

CONFLICT REGULATION, Paul Wehr (Westview, 1979) A comprehensive survey of both the theories of the origins of conflict in the international system and the methods of regulating it. A major portion of the book contains descriptions of the Norwegion resistance, Gandhi's campaign methods and the Rocky Flats anti-nuclear campaign. Wehr believes that conflict is an inherent aspect of the international system and argues that conflict can lead to constructive change without reliance on widespread violence.

THE STRATEGY OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE, Adam Roberts (ed) (Faber & Faber, 1967) A provocative collection of essays proposing an alternative to military defense, arranged in three sections: The first on the nature of problems to be faced (i.e., military attack, coup d'etat, totalitarianism); the second on the lessons of past experiences with non-violent action against aggression; and the third on political, strategic and operational aspects of a civilian defense policy. Of particular interest is the concluding essay which raises important questions about the meaning and implications of civilian defense.

THE POLITICS OF NON-VIOLENT ACTION, Gene Sharp (Porter Sargent, 1973) The most extensive current description and analysis of the many forms of non-violent conflict prosecution aimed at promoting change, preserving human rights and conducting international conflict. Vol. 1 deals with the nature and control of political power and a brief treatment of the practice of non-violent action which includes examples from American, Latin American, European and Indian history. Vol. 2 provides an encyclopedic look at methods of non-violent action; Vol. 3 discusses the dynamics of non-violent action.

GANDHI AS A POLITICAL STRATEGIST, Gene Sharp (Porter Sargent, 1979) An in-depth analysis of Gandhi's political strategy and his relevance for today. Gandhi's theory of non-violence is explored as well as his ideas about non-violent national defense. Sharp argues that India's adoption of non-violent struggle to end British occupation was primarily a political act based on calculations of effectiveness. Also included are four essays on ethics and politics.

- CONSCRIPTION -

THE DRAFT: A HANDBOOK OF FACTS AND ALTERNATIVES, Sol Tax (University of Chicago Press, 1967) Based on a 1966 conference held at the University of Chicago, this anthology includes selections by Lt. General Hershey, Erik Erikson, Sen. Edward Kennedy, Margaret Mead and others. Although slightly dated, it is still valuable as a comprehensive survey of analysis of the draft and alternatives to it.

CONSCRIPTION: A WORLD SURVEY, Devi Prasad and Tony Smythe (War Resisters International, 1968) Examines the status of conscription and particularly conscientious objection in nearly every country of the world.

(Conscription, continued)

CHANCE AND CIRCUMSTANCE: THE DRAFT, THE WAR AND THE VIETNAM GENERATION, Lawrence Baskir and William Strauss (Knopf, 1978) An attempt to study and analyze the effects of the Vietnam war on the 25 million men who did not fight. With chapters on avoiders, evaders, deserters, exiles and other topics, this book clearly shows that the tragedy of war took place at home as well as on the battlefield. An objective, well-documented and readable book.

HANDBOOK FOR CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS, Arlo Tatum (CCCO, 1972) The basic handbook containing much of the information used in the 1960's by individuals considering C.O. positions. While much of the material is dated, the requirements for C.O. status explored in this book are not likely to change drastically.

CONFLICT OF LOYALTIES: THE CASE FOR SELECTIVE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION, James Finn (ed) (Pegasus, 1968) Thoughtful arguments for governmental recognition of conscientious objection to a particular war, but not all war. Selections by Michael Harrington, Mulford Sibley, Arnold Kaufman and others.

prepared by

The World Education Center
c/o World Without War Council
1730 Grove Street
Berkeley CA 94709

8/1/80

A LAST WORD AND AN INVITATION

Only a fool is morally arrogant in defense of his decision to participate or to refuse to participate in war. Few men who felt they should help drop bombs on Dresden or napalm on Vietnam were wholly confident that what they did was morally justified. Similarly, few sensitive pacifists would describe standing by while Nazi officials push six million innocents into gas ovens as an admirable moral act.

So long as some political leaders use military violence to impose their will, there is no satisfactory moral answer to problems of conscience and war. Accepting responsibility for waging war involves one moral price. The refusal to participate may involve one just as painful to pay.

Good men will continue to differ on their personal response to military conscription. Whatever their personal choice, all who see the moral dilemma have the same obligation: Whether at present a pacifist or an officer in the Strategic Air Command, they should help in progress toward an end to war.

That is no easy task, but it is a feasible one. Once it is understood that such progress does not require perfecting human souls or ending all conflict, the goal becomes an achievable one. It is possible to resolve conflict without violence. Many of the conditions for establishing the legal and political processes that are an alternative to war now exist. Our country could lead in bringing into being those which do not yet exist.

But we will not do so. Not without widespread agreement that that is the role we want our country to play in world politics. Not without better ideas than have yet appeared as to how to persuade adversary nations to join us in making progress toward a world without war.

Will you help those seeking to forge that agreement and to develop those ideas?

Robert Pickus
President

World Without War Council
1730 Grove Street
Berkeley CA 94709
415/845-1992

Draft counseling tends to be undertaken by groups hostile to military conscription. Whether proceeding from the currently fashionable views of the political left or from a profound religious witness against war (or from that curious mixture of the two that bedevils the peace movement), the result is the same: tendentious counseling.

The best antidote is not bland "neutral" counseling, but counseling and conscience and war events which proceed from a very different perspective -- one which includes respect for learning, for reasoned discourse, for a citizen's responsibility in a democracy, and for those promptings of the spirit which move a man to oppose war.

THE WORLD WITHOUT WAR COUNCIL'S APPROACH TO DRAFT COUNSELING

1. Challenge -- Because few young people have had to think about the problems of war and peace as they relate to their lives, we use a questioning approach; one that will provoke thought and help free the individual from current cliches. By challenging a person's beliefs (whatever they are), we hope to aid him in clarifying the values and reasoning which sustain his final choice.

2. Traditions -- There are religious and political traditions which have dealt with these choices. We recognize the value of, say, 2000 years of thought on these matters in a time when many have only the day's headlines to set the context for their choice. We encourage people to explore first their own tradition's teachings.

3. Depth -- We recognize the profundity of the questions that must be faced and the serious consequences attendant on different choices. We urge others to share that recognition and to avoid dangerous combinations of passion and ignorance that so often dominate these discussions.

4. Balance -- We make a special effort to introduce people to the range of choices open to them. We explore with them the competing moral and political perspectives which sustain different responses to the draft.

5. Integrity -- Some men will enter the armed forces. Others will apply for C.O. status and get it, or go to jail rather than be inducted. Some will resist registration or leave the country. Others will, as C.O.'s, serve

in a non-combatant capacity in the military. We see crucial moral problems within any particular choice, as well as between the different positions. A man who conscientiously chooses to enter the armed forces and a man who becomes a conscientious objector either to registration or to military service may have more in common with each other than with one who seeks to evade the draft or simply enters the army unquestioningly. We explore problems of personal integrity as well as the larger issues of political philosophy and religious belief.

6. Accurate information -- A good decision must be based on adequate, accurate information. Most of the legal and administrative processes are clear. It is difficult, however, to predict accurately the consequences of a particular course of action. Some agencies use predictions of what might happen to influence a man's decision. We do not. We reject that approach to draft counseling which, for example, urges a man to refuse to register by predicting that the legal penalties will not be applied.

7. Dilemma -- Recognizing that all decisions concerning participation in the military are difficult, we are hostile to draft counseling which channels young people into the counselor's own political and moral perspective. We recognize the validity of choices arising from an informed conscience, whether that choice be conscientious participation in war or conscientious refusal to participate. We make the moral and political ground of our own position explicit, but do our best to acquaint those we counsel with the case for and against competing positions.

8. End war -- Our approach to counseling is set in the Council's end-war context. We distinguish this approach from a "just war," a "never war," or a "crusade" approach to the use of military power. We test each particular response to registration and the draft by asking whether it will be of aid or will itself constitute an obstacle to progress toward a world without war. We know that an arms race can lead to war, as can an attempted American withdrawal from contests of power in the international arena. People can make their response to the draft the occasion for determining their role in developing fresh approaches to problems of national security and in progress toward a world that resolves international conflict without mass violence. We encourage them to do so.

over ...

9. Community -- Conscience is not the only consideration in decisions regarding war and peace. We understand the citizen's responsibility to aid in the common defense of his community and to uphold the laws of his country. We see the formation of political community as one crucial requisite for a world capable of resolving international conflict without violence. We feel a sense of responsibility to our own political community, the United States of America. We value its potential for leadership in turning a nascent sense of world community into legal and political processes that are an alternative to war. We therefore emphasize the responsibilities of citizenship as well as of conscientious opposition to war. Few young men encounter us without encountering Socrates and his choice in the Crito. They learn the difference between principled civil disobedience undertaken openly, in conscience, and with a willingness to accept the legal penalties involved, and attempts to evade the law or violently to overthrow it. In our conscience and war work, we seek to strengthen, not damage, that sense of political community which makes possible the non-violent resolution of conflict within our own society.

10. Compassion -- We recognize the painful situation of young men facing the draft. While believing that a serious attempt to determine one's own best choice can be a positive and maturing experience, we know it is also a bewildering and frightening one. We offer needed support to families and to young people caught in that situation.

11. Institutions -- Though we do draft counseling and organize our own Citizen Responsibility, Conscience and War events, our primary energies go into persuading other major community institutions (e.g., churches, synagogues, schools) to develop their own programs for their constituencies. We are ready to assist in gaining needed agreement, structuring the program, training leadership, writing materials, and securing funds for such programs.

Jim Zwick
Robert Pickus
World Without War Council
of Northern California
1730 Grove Street
Berkeley CA 94709

19 August 1980

SEVEN ROADS TO A WORLD WITHOUT WAR

Is war inevitable? Does war just happen? If war is really unthinkable, why do humans engage in it? These are questions about which people have argued for hours and days and about which there will be debate for years to come. Unfortunately, it is likely that no amount of discussion on these questions will lead the world away from war. To reach that goal, the one question — which must be debated, discussed, answered and answered again -- is:

WHAT IS REQUIRED IF WE ARE TO ACHIEVE A WORLD IN WHICH WAR IS NO LONGER A LEGITIMATE WAY OF RESOLVING CONFLICTS BETWEEN NATIONS?

Robert Pickus and Robert Woito, in a book titled To End War*, give one response to this question. They identify seven essential goals toward which we must work. The authors assert that progress on these "roads" will be progress toward a world where war is no longer a legitimate instrument of foreign policy. The "seven roads" are summarized here to illustrate a specific response to the question posed above.

NOTE: No answer to this question that has yet been given has worked, so you will be right to approach the Seven Roads skeptically. It is, however, a clear answer. Does it make sense to you? Are there some roads that are missing? Do you think that some of the roads included seem to miss the mark? How would you answer the question: what is required if we are to achieve a world without war?

I. The Seven Roads

The first four of these roads make up a set of conditions essential for a world without war. The last three are enabling processes -- means directed to achieving those conditions. As Gandhi would have put it, the means are the "goals in process."

A. A Set of Conditions

1. DISARMAMENT: General, complete, universal and enforceable disarmament is a necessary condition for a world that no longer relies on war to settle disputes. This means all weapons in every country. But agreeing to get rid of the weapons of war alone is not sufficient. Disarmament must be enforced by legal sanctions and comprehensive inspection. In addition, the world will need alternative procedures for resolving inevitable conflicts.

2. WORLD LAW: An improved United Nations and growth toward world law can provide alternative procedures for resolving conflicts and protecting rights. Law must be strong enough to enforce agreements

* Harper & Row, 1971. New edition (World Without War Publications) pending.

over ...

but not so strong as to intrude upon the basic rights of nations and the human rights of individuals. But, there can be no law without a sense of community to sustain it.

3. WORLD COMMUNITY: A strengthened sense of world community is essential in order to provide the foundation for agreement and for enforcement of law. This sense of community is necessary if law is to be based on consent and mutual responsibility rather than be imposed by the threat and use of violence.

4. CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT: Most people in today's world live under conditions of deprivation and exploitation. This is no basis on which to build a sense of community. Hence, another essential condition for a world without war is work for social, economic and political development, i.e., for a more equitable distribution of the world's resources, respect for human dignity, and freedom for people to participate in the political life of their country if they so choose.

B. Enabling Processes

5. FORCING CHANGE WITHOUT VIOLENCE: Since values must be defended and needed change sometimes forced, those who turn away from mass violence must be skilled in using other ways to confront obstalces to constructive change and to resolve conflict.

6. AGREEMENT AMONG NATIONS: The essential conditions for a world without war can only be realized if the nations and peoples of the world agree to pursue a disarmed world under law, a world in which war is no longer a legitimate instrument of foreign policy. The challenge to us as Americans is to find ways in which our country can be a leader in gaining this agreement. This requires a realistic assessment of power and purpose in our own government and that of other power centers (e.g.. the Soviet Union, China, the OPEC nations, etc.). This assessment rejects both a devil theory that sees Communism, for example, as a rigid,monolithic, totally evil force, and an unwarranted optimism that ignores the threat to democratic values and world peace in our world today.

7. ROOTS: Progress on the other six roads is unlikely without people and nations driven by a sense of requirement to explore them. That sense of requirement comes when human beings touch those root values which assert the oneness of the human family, the dignity of the individual and the transcendence of the human spirit. That sense of requirement is built on the tradition and the authority which sustains the commandment "Thou shalt not kill." Whether stated in religious or ethical terms, widespread understanding of why people should turn away from war is one essential road.

II. A Look at Some Specific Steps on the Roads

**How would you judge specific events in terms of the seven roads?
Which would you consider steps forward on each of the roads?
Which would you see as obstacles to progress?**

DIRECTIONS: Under each of the Seven Roads are listed some recent world events. Put a plus (+) before the items you consider steps toward achieving the goals. Put a minus (-) before items you believe present obstacles to the goals. Some events may seem to be clearly progress on the road; others, clearly steps toward war. There may be some events that have elements of both progress and regression. You may want to develop your own list of events for each of the roads.

1. DISARMAMENT

( ) A. Ratification of SALT I and continuation (despite the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan) of interest in pursuing SALT II.

( ) B. World military budgets increase steadily from year to year. The greatest percentage increases are found in Third World countries.

( ) C. President Carter, Prime Minister Begin and President Sadat sign peace treaty between Israel and Egypt.

( ) D. SALT II agreements allow for the development of the U.S. MX missile and the U.S.S.R. Backfire bomber.

( ) E. China conducts nuclear testing in the atmosphere.

( ) F. At the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction talks in Vienna (1978) NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries reach agreement on procedures for estimating military manpower after exchange of detailed data.

2. WORLD LAW

( ) A. At the on-going sessions of the U.N. Law of the Sea Conference, the nations agree on about 96% of the many issues before the conference.

( ) B. Iran takes 53 Americans hostage.

( ) C. Britain serves as arbiter and assists in settling disputes over control of Rhodesia. Rhodesia becomes the independent Zimbabwe, averting further bloodshed.

( ) D. Nations fail to agree to international control of the whaling industry. Some fear that Japanese and Soviet whaling practices endanger the survival of some species of whales.

( ) E. The U.N. General Assembly demands the immediate and total withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan but does not name the Soviet Union as the invader.

( ) F. The United States takes the case of the American hostages in Iran to the International Court of Justice.

over ...

3. WORLD COMMUNITY

( ) A. On December 10, 1978, the world celebrated the 30th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

( ) B. Governments of the Western nations meet to discuss how to respond to the problems of Southeast Asian refugees.

( ) C. Other nations join with the U.S. in boycotting the Moscow Olympics because of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

( ) D. China holds a technical and cultural exhibit in San Francisco. The U.S. will send a technical exhibit to the People's Republic.

( ) E. Some developing countries call for world recognition of a country's right to absolute control of its natural resources; industrialized countries seek ways to become self-sufficient.

( ) F. 840 scientists from 34 countries protest Moscow's refusal to allow a distinguished Soviet physicist to participate in the meeting of the International Union of Pure and Applied Physics. The statement claimed that the fact that some physicists cannot participate can only lead to deterioration of scientific relations between countries.

4. CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT

( ) A. Cuban refugees crowd into Miami.

( ) B. U.S. foreign aid bill directs the Agency for International Development to concentrate on the needs of the world's poorest.

( ) C. The World Health Organization announces that it is very close to eliminating small pox from all the countries of the world.

( ) D. World Bank's capital base is enlarged, enabling the Bank to increase its lending, particularly to the Third World.

( ) E. Modernization efforts in Southeast Asia are accompanied by political and social upheavals and the rise of authoritarian and totalitarian governments.

( ) F. OPEC's increase in oil prices means that farmers in the Third World will have to pay more for petroleum products used as fuel and fertilizer.

5. FORCING CHANGE WITHOUT VIOLENCE

( ) A. Soviet Nobel Prize-winning physicist Andrei Sakharov calls on the U.S. to put pressure on the Soviet Union to withdraw from Afghanistan. He and his wife are sent to Gorky, a military center which is closed to foreigners.

( ) B. The Blacks and Coloureds in South Africa boycott the schools while calling on the government to improve educational opportunities for their children.

( ) C. U.N. Secretary Kurt Waldheim attempts to negotiate a settlement between Vietnam and China over disputed territory along their mutual border.

( ) D. The Somoza government is overthrown by the Sandanista army in Nicaragua.

( ) E. The IRA (Irish Republican Army) claims credit for London bombings, in an attempt to force Britain out of Ireland.

( ) F. In response to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, President Carter announces his intention to re-activate Selective Service registration.

6. GAINING AGREEMENT

( ) A. In the last few months, many Americans have come to believe that Communism is a monolithic giant that seeks to conquer the world.

( ) B. American leftist groups accuse the U.S. of being the primary cause of war. The U.S., they claim, is controlled by the military/industrial complex.

( ) C. Helmut Schmidt, West German Chancellor, meets with Leonid Brezhnev of the Soviet Union, and reports a new willingness on the part of the U.S.S.R. to negotiate a limit to theater nuclear weapons.

( ) D. Arab world reacts to Israel's reassertion of claims to all of Jerusalem with bursts of public fury.

( ) E. Senator Henry Jackson claims that the Senate is not going to ratify SALT II as long as the Soviet presence in Afghanistan continues.

( ) F. Hard-line Islamic clerics oppose Bani-Sadr, Iran's Prime Minister, who is seen by most in the West as a political moderate.

7. ROOTS

( ) A. Pacem in Terris and Vatican II documents seriously question just war theory.

( ) B. Few local religious congregations discuss the moral and ethical problems that war poses.

( ) C. President Carter's initial human rights efforts were applauded by many, but sustained interest in promoting international human rights lags.

( ) D. U.S. celebrates the 200th anniversary of its Constitution and Bill of Rights.

( ) E. There is no fundamental change in the advocacy of violence by Communist and Third World liberation movements.

( ) F. Pope John Paul II tells Catholic clergy that they must not hold public office.

prepared by the World Education Center
c/o the World Without War Council
1730 Grove Street, Berkeley, CA
94709

8.3.80

"END OF DOCUMENT"